DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 392 SP 004 459

AUTHOR	Weinberg, Meyer
TITLE	Desegregation Research: An Appraisal. Second Edition.
INSTITUTION	Phi Delta Kappa, Bloomington, Ind.
PUB DATE	May 70
NOTE	467p.
AVAILABLE FRCM	Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., Bloomington, Ind. 47401 ($3.75)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$1.75 HC-$23.45
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement, Caucasian Students, *Educational Research, *Ethnic Stereotypes, *Integration Effects, *Integration Studies, Intelligence Quotient, Negro Students, Race Relations, Racial Differences, *Racial Integration, *School Integration, Self Concept

ABSTRACT

This publication reviews research related to the effects of school desegregation on the academic achievement and self-concept of white students, and non-Negro minorities, and on race relations within the community. Separate chapters are devoted to the Riverside School Study, a 5-year school desegregation program with extensive evaluation and research components which is scheduled to be completed in 1972, and to two federal reports--the Equal Educational Opportunity Survey by the U. S. Office of Education, and Racial Isolation in the Public Schools by the United States Commission on Civil Rights. Conclusions drawn from the research studies reviewed are that desegregation improves the academic achievement and self-concept of Negro students, while not impairing those of white students, and also improves race relations within the community. The publication contains an author index, a geographical area index to the research studies reviewed, and a 55-page bibliography. (RT)

ED0 44392

DESEGREGATION RESEARCH:
AN APPRAISAL

2nd Edition

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BY

MEYER WEINBERG

City Colleges of Chicago

PHI DELTA KAPPA

Bloomington, Indiana

May, 1970

SP004459

A project of the Phi Delta Kappa Commission
on Education, Human Rights, and Responsibilities
prepared with financial assistance from the United
States Office of Education.

Library of Congress Card No. 77-121225

Cover Design by Larry Klein & Associates

To

David, Daniel, Carl, and Benjamin

FOREWORD
to First Edition

Few persons would deny that there has been more discussion of school desegregation than of any other issue at every level of American life--within the family, the neighborhood, and within local, state and national governmental agencies. Until only a few years ago the protagonists had little basic research upon which to base their arguments for or against desegregation; the primary sources of support appeared to be the same for either group, i. e., legal, moral or philosophical. But during the period, 1958-68, while the public and private debates were being held throughout the country, a number of researchers designed experimental studies to test the myriads of hypotheses attendant to school desegregation (e. g. mixing white and Negro children in school will result in a lowering of academic standards, white children will not receive as good an education as in the past, Negro children will become more hostile to whites because of frustration over not being able to compete successfully in the desegregated classroom, or higher achievement by all students can be expected in desegregated schools, etc.). Such research efforts continue to increase in number and quality, and they are providing the foundation upon which justifiable educational postures can be constructed.

The contribution of the author, through this report of an assessment of the research on desegregation conducted to date, is unquestionably a "benchmark" in the field. The evaluation of research on desegregation reported herein will be useful to educational researchers, to students of the process of change, to school officials as they reorganize curricula for instructional purposes, and to those persons who plan pre-service and in-service preparation programs for teachers.

The evaluation of the research represents the work and the interpretations of the author, and does not necessarily represent the Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Education, Human Rights, and Responsibilities or that of the fraternity in general; however, the Commission is pleased to have been associated with Mr. Weinberg in the production of this important book. This book was prepared under the sponsorship of the Commission on Education, Human Rights, and Responsibilities of Phi Delta Kappa and was supported by a grant from the U. S. Office of Education, which, however, assumes no responsibility for the content.

— James H. Bash
For the Commission

PREFACE
to Second Edition

The present edition has been expanded to cover research that was completed during 1967-1969. In a number of cases, I have reported on older research that seems to illuminate some contemporary problems. I have made a special effort to evaluate the consequences of the research for the classroom as well as for its broader social science import.

The dissertation research would be beyond the reach of a single investigator were it not for the excellent service of University Microfilms, Inc. The ERIC System was indispensable. Requests for single pieces of research were filled graciously by Princeton University Library, several school boards, governmental agencies, and numerous researchers.

A new feature is the geographical index of studies. It lists the state in which each study was made.

I wish to thank the following for helping to prepare this new edition with great dispatch and care: Lillian S. Calhoun, Gertrude S. Martin, Gladys Hamilton, Cleo I. Havener, and Patricia E. Moseley. Special thanks are due to Mrs. Suzanne D. Price, Chief Analysis, Resources and Materials Staff, Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, of the United States Office of Education, who initiated arrangements for the new edition, and Dr. Maynard Bemis, Executive Secretary of Phi Delta Kappa, who facilitated the project by administering the budget and by making publication arrangements.

___ Meyer Weinberg

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword iv

Preface vi

Chapter

1 Introduction 1

2 Desegregation and Academic Achievement 31

3 Aspirations and Self-Concept 89

4 The Student in School and in the Family 157

5 The Riverside School Study 229

6 Non-Negro Minorities 239

7 Two Federal Reports 278

8 The Negro Community and Desegregation 307

9 Anti-Desegregation Critics 348

10 Conclusions 378

Author Index 386

Geographic Index 403

Bibliography 405

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"It is not enough to believe in equality," writes De Vos, "we must see what science can say further about it."[1] The present work is an attempt to see what "science says" about the educational consequences of school desegregation.

Two decades ago, the present work could not have been written; there just wasn't that much desegregation to study. Since then, social practice has overtaken the scholars. Today, sufficient desegregation has occurred so that scholars have a surfeit of experience to study. Unfortunately, however, the scholars now lag behind the reality. In 1966, a Federal official in charge of desegregation enforcement activities replied to a Congressional inquiry as to the existence of research on desegregation: "The basic problem is there are very few researchers that want to work on it for some reason, but it is a very real problem."[2]

Nevertheless, considerable research has been done. Much of it remains unpublished or is circulated only within narrow circles of experts. The present volume is the first book-length review of the field; a number of excellent reviews of research have appeared that encompass parts of the field or shorter periods.

---

[1] George De Vos in Caste and Race: Comparative Approaches, ed. by Anthony de Reuck and Julie Knight (Boston Little, Brown, 1967), p. 289.

[2] David S. Seeley in U.S. Congress, 89th, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Special Subcommittee on Civil Rights, Guidelines for School Desegregation Hearings (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 139.

A clarification of key terms would seem to be in order. These are: segregation, desegregation, integration, and deprivation.

For purposes of this study the term _segregation_ is defined as a socially patterned separation of people, with or without explicit sanction. The legal distinction between _de facto_ and _de jure_ segregation has not been found to be of any consequence in studying the impact of segregation upon children. The essential mark of a segregated school is not the presence of a certain ethnic mixture although a number of practical measures of the mixture have been offered by students of the problem. Fundamentally, a school is segregated when the community comes to view the school in its nature to be inferior and unsuitable for privileged children. For example, a school is segregated whenever it becomes known as a "Negro school." The stigma imposed upon the school by the community makes it segregated; virtually always, a stigmatized school will be deprived of an equal share of community resources inasmuch as the control of the resources, too, is socially patterned.

If a school is considered by the community to be adequate for minority children but not for majority children, that school is segregated. A pragmatic test of this distinction is easily applied to what is often called "reverse busing," i.e., the busing of white children to a predominantly Negro school. White parents most frequently--and at times with justification--object that the transfer would result in their children being placed in a poor school with a negative effect on their learning. The significant point is not the accuracy of the white complaint but the tacit assumption by whites that the same contention does not apply to the Negro children.

The term _desegregation_ is defined as the abolition of social practices that bar equal access to opportunity or that bar equal access to the "mainstream of American life." The effort is to create new patterns of interaction by altering the organizational and administrative structures that contribute to segregation. Desegregation is thus a matter that can be effectuated through administrative measures. It needs only to be decided, and it can be done; its success does not require special kinds of children or teachers or administrators.

The significance of desegregation is missed, however, if we characterize it merely as "moving bodies." To be sure the attendance of Negro and white children in a common school is the most obvious feature of desegregation. It is psychological naivete to imagine that such attendance in a race conscious society is without consequence for the students involved. The research results reported in the present work suggest that the consequences are pervasive, profound, and complex.

The term integration is defined as the realization of equal opportunity by deliberate cooperation and without regard to racial or other social barriers. The concept of integration stresses realization of equal opportunity: "Education which is equally bad for everyone is not integrated education; it simply skimps educational opportunity in like manner for all. Thus, integrated education of low quality is a contradiction in terms."[1]

In an integrated school, individual differences would bear no stigma as it became clear that these were not social differences in disguise. Students, teachers, and administrators would cease making invidious comparisons as differences ceased being stigmatic. Acceptance, mutual respect, and cooperation are the tempers of an integrated school.

The term deprivation is defined as the socially-patterned withholding of educational opportunity from selected groups of persons. Reference is to a group pattern and not to isolated deprived persons. The concept of deprivation implies withheld advantages and this would seem to be more adequately conceived as a group phenomenon. Deprivation and privilege are opposites, even though the privilege be merely the right to attend a white school that is only slightly less inferior than the Negro school. Segregation has, of course, often been used to allocate opportunities among the deprived as well as the privileged; indeed, it is a question whether it has ever been used for anything else. Problems of deprivation are compounded by consideration of race and class. All the deprived, more or less, are also segregated. But for Negroes, race is an additional depressive factor.

---

[1] Meyer Weinberg, Research on School Desegregation: Review and Prospect (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1965), p. 29. See also James S. Coleman, The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity, unpublished paper read at a conference of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, October 21, 1967.

In the present work studies are examined which shed light on the experience of children in desegregated schools. Ideally, such a study would compare the achievement or other characteristics of individual children both "before and after" desegregation. Forces that impinge on desegregation--such as social class or region or residence--could be controlled while racial composition of the school or the class--room was varied. Unfortunately, attempting to separate the influence of social class from race is sometimes as difficult as separating the red from the white in pink.

Only a few researchers have distinguished between a desegregated and a transitional school. The latter type is an all-white school in the process of becoming a predominantly Negro school; whereas a desegregated school is characterized by a stable interracial student body. Obviously, the setting in the transitional school is highly unfavorable to constructive and productive student relations. Confusion of the two types of interracial schools is not uncommon.

SCOPE OF DESEGREGATION

The extent of interracial schooling has never been measured accurately. The publication of hitherto-unavailable data, however, permits the making of a tolerably definite figure.

Early in 1970, the Office of Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (OCR-HEW) released a compilation of elementary and high school racial composition covering fall, 1968.[1] It listed five ethnic groups--white, Negro, Spanish-surnamed, American Indian, and Oriental--and noted the number of each enrolled in schools containing a predominance--half or more--of other ethnic groups. These figures enable us to observe the degree to which children attend ethnically homogeneous or heterogeneous schools.

According to data in the OCR-HEW compilation in fall, 1968, students were apportioned among the ethnic groups as follows:

Whites	34,697,133
Negroes	6,282,173
Spanish-surnamed	2,002,776
American Indian	177,464
Oriental	194,022
Total	43,353,568

Of these numbers:

*716,980--or 2.1 percent of all--white students attended schools in which they made up less than half the enrollment.

*1,467,291--or 23.4 percent of all--Negro students attended schools in which minority children made up less than half the enrollment.

*906,919--or 45.3 percent of all-Spanish-surnamed students attended schools in which minority children made up less than half the enrollment.

*109,540--or 61.7 percent of all[2] --American Indian students attended schools in which minority children made up less than half the enrollment.

*140,069--or 72.2 percent of all--Oriental students attended schools in which minority children made up less than half the enrollment.

---

[1] Release dated January 4, 1970.

[2] Does not include 52,400 students in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools or an undetermined number in private schools.

Thus, a total of at least 3,343,799 students attended schools in which their own ethnic group was not predominant.

This number represents one-thirteenth of all children attending elementary and secondary public schools. Proportionately, nearly fifteen times as many minority children attend these inter-ethnic schools as do white children. As a result, 78.6 percent of the total enrollment in inter-ethnic schools is made up of minority children.

How are these 3.3 million students distributed by city and ethnic composition of school? Such figures are available only for the 100 largest school districts and for Negroes and whites. According to one compilation drawn up by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Company, in fall, 1968, in the 100 districts, 478,352 Negro students attended predominantly white schools and 223,016 white students attended predominantly Negro schools.[1] Table 1 shows the distribution by school district. In Richmond, Virginia and Louisville, Kentucky, for example, every tenth white student is in a predominantly Negro school. In Flint and Detroit, Michigan the proportion is somewhat higher.

Considerably more than 3.3 million students attend inter-ethnic schools. The OCR-HEW listing reported only predominant--i.e., more than half--proportions of schools.

---

[1] Data from columns 7 and 8, Schedule 1, Analysis of Student Enrollment of One Hundred Largest School District." August 6, 1969, compiled by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Co., Certified Public Accountants, Jackson, Mississippi for Mr. Robert C. Cannada, Attorney-at-Law, Jackson, Mississippi. Files of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington, D.C. were the source of these data; material was taken from Forms OS/CR 102-1 and OS/CR 101. White students" are all those students not designated as minority group members. This material antedated the OCR-HEW study by five months. While the later source differs in some respects from the earlier one, I have chosen to use the earlier one because it alone gives data on whites in predominantly Negro schools throughout the 100 school districts.

Clearly, however, many students attend schools in which they constitute a significant number if not a predominance. In New York State, for example, while 154,415 Negroes and Puerto Ricans attended predominantly white schools, more than twice as many (364,011) attended schools whose proportions of whites range from 11 percent to 90.9 percent.[1] If one may generalize this difference, we can speak of some 6 million students in inter-ethnic schools.

After fall, 1968, two contradictory trends were underway: (1) white students continued to leave urban schools for suburban schools; and (2) federal courts sharply increased their compliance standards and brought about more desegregation. Because of the October, 1969 "desegregate now" decision by the U.S. Supreme Court, compliance spread, although unevenly.

Overall, it may be estimated that from 6.5 million to 7.0 million elementary and secondary students are in interethnic schools. This is somewhat under a seventh of the total. In 1968, 434,000 Negroes were reported as enrolled in colleges and universities.[2] Only about half this number attended institutions that were not predominantly Negro. White college students numbered 6,500,000, the vast majority in all-white schools. The number of Spanish-surnamed, American Indian, and Oriental students in colleges is quite small. In virtually every case, however, these students attend interethnic colleges.

Since 1954, the number of children attending interethnic schools has grown by a very large factor. As of the time of the Desegregation Decision, fifty-four of the

---

1. Robert P. O'Reilly and Associates, Racial and Social Class Isolation in the Schools (Albany, N.Y.: Division of Research and Evaluation, New York State Education Department, December, 1969), p. 91. Data are for 1968.

2. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 190, "School Enrollment: October, 1968 and 1967" (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p.1.

presently 100 largest school districts listed in Table 1 were legally segregated. In a number of the others, segregation existed without explicit legal sanction.

The number of Negro and Spanish-surnamed youths living in urban centers has increased sharply, thus providing a broader base for interethnic schools. On the other hand, the persistence of segregation patterns has also increased the absolute number of children attending segregated schools, given the considerable increase in population. Thus, the number of both segregated and desegregated has expanded. This process is continuing.

TABLE 1

Negro and White Students Attending Public Schools in Which They are in the Minority, One Hundred Largest School Districts in the United States, Fall, 1969[1]

	NEGRO		WHITE	
District	Number.	% of Negro Students in District	Number	% of White Students in District
Birmingham, Ala.	2,472	7.2	122	0.4
Jefferson County, Ala.	534	2.9	63	0.1
Mobile, Ala.	3,442	10.9	305	0.7
Montgomery, Ala.	924	5.5	--	--
San Juan, Carmichael, Calif.	134	100.0	--	--
Fresno, Calif.	1,228	23.4	64	0.2
Garden Grove, Calif.	83	100.0	--	--
Long Beach, Calif.	2,817	51.3	1,044	1.7
San Francisco, Calif.	7,525	29.0	5,244	13.5
Los Angeles, Calif.	12,081	8.2	7,793	2.2
Mt. Diablo, Concord Calif.	369	100.0	--	--
Oakland, Calif.	4,308	12.2	4,233	21.3
Richmond, Calif.	4,046	38.8	1,446	5.0
Sacramento, Calif.	5,898	80.5	356	1.0
San Diego, Calif.	4,852	32.3	1,075	1.1
Denver, Colo.	3,133	23.0	1,449	2.3
Jefferson, Lakewood, Colo.	60	100.0	--	--
District of Columbia	1,253	0.9	3,636	43.9
Dade, Miami, Fla.	8,533	15.1	1,558	1.1
Orange, Orlando, Fla.	2,627	20.1	186	0.3
Hillsborough, Tampa, Fla.	3,770	19.6	637	0.9
Palm Beach, W. Palm Beach, Fla.	3,191	18.6	369	0.9
Brevard, Titusville, Fla.	4,414	69.8	--	--
Pinellas, Clearwater, Fla.	2,762	21.7	489	0.7

---

[1] See Footnote 1, p. 3.

	NEGRO		WHITE	
Duval, Jacksonville, Fla.	4,377	12.6	24	--
Broward, Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.	3,556	14.5	833	1.1
Escambia, Pensacola, Fla.	2,983	23.1	612	1.8
Polk, Bartow, Fla.	3,815	32.7	61	0.2
Dekalb, Decatur, Ga.	1,845	44.7	342	0.5
Atlanta, Ga.	3,729	5.4	1,614	3.8
Muscogee, Columbus, Ga.	884	7.1	449	1.5
Chatham, Savannah, Ga.	1,620	9.3	590	2.4
Chicago, Ill.	12,554	4.1	13,716	6.2
Fort Wayne, Ind.	1,549	26.9	1,234	3.5
Indianapolis, Indiana	8,205	22.4	3,212	4.5
Gary, Ind.	1,879	6.3	916	6.5
Des Moines, Iowa	2,057	57.0	884	2.1
Wichita, Kansas	4,058	45.5	200	0.3
Jefferson, Louisville, Ky.	2,365	57.6	1	--
Louisville, Ky.	3,432	13.5	3,197	10.8
E. Baton Rouge, La.	1,333	5.6	216	0.5
Calcasieu, Lake Charles, La.	948	9.5	--	--
New Orleans, La.	6,569	8.8	3,465	10.0
Caddo, Shreveport, La.	648	2.5	37	0.1
Jefferson, Gretna, La.	2,632	20.5	--	--
Anne Arundel, Annapolis, Md.	7,318	82.0	1,081	1.9
Baltimore, Md.	9,646	7.7	8,576	12.8
Montgomery, Rockville, Md.	4,872	100.0	--	--
Baltimore Co., Baltimore, Md.	4,301	100.0	--	--
Prince George, Marlboro, Md.	12,525	56.1	2,346	1.9
Boston, Mass.	6,359	25.0	4,093	6.3
Detroit, Mich.	19,685	11.2	16,768	14.6
Flint, Mich.	4,165	24.2	3,629	12.7
Minneapolis, Minn.	3,730	71.0	1,108	1.8
St. Paul, Minn.	2,556	87.6	11	--
Jackson, Miss.	544	3.0	324	1.6
St. Louis, Mo.	5,244	7.1	2,178	5.2
Kansas City, Mo.	4,865	14.0	2,281	5.8
Omaha, Neb.	2,309	20.5	1,617	3.2
Clark, Las Vegas, Nev.	3,961	48.1	128	0.2
Albuquerque, N.M.	1,212	63.9	135	0.3
Jersey City, N.J.	4,061	25.4	2,138	13.0
Newark, N.J.	2,285	4.2	3,936	28.7
Buffalo, N.Y.	7,249	27.5	1,457	3.3
Rochester, N.Y.	6,232	45.6	1,781	5.6
New York City, N.Y.	89,446	26.7	44,983	9.6
Charlotte, M., N.C.	6,704	27.7	1,163	2.0
Winston Salem, N.C.	2,111	15.3	17	--

	NEGRO		WHITE	
Cleveland, Ohio	4,631	5.3	3,572	5.4
Cincinnati, Ohio	8,171	21.9	5,861	11.9
Toledo, Ohio	4,554	27.6	1,485	3.4
Akron, Ohio	5,705	37.7	2,207	5.1
Columbus, Ohio	8,263	28.8	3,947	4.8
Dayton, Ohio	2,488	10.9	1,077	2.9
Oklahoma City, Okla.	2,037	12.5	631	1.1
Portland, Ore.	3,664	56.7	1,039	1.5
Tulsa, Okla.	1,517	15.6	566	0.9
Philadelphia, Pa.	16,401	9.9	18,468	16.9
Pittsburgh, Pa.	6,366	21.3	4,015	8.7
Charleston, S.C.	2,585	15.5	716	2.4
Richland, Columbia, S.C.	3,231	17.2	168	0.8
Greenville, S.C.	1,839	14.8	214	0.5
Shelby, Memphis, Tenn.	950	6.7	6	--
Memphis, Tenn.	1,765	2.6	1,313	2.3
Nashville, Tenn.	3,689	16.4	1,958	2.8
Austin, Texas	1,214	15.6	327	1.0
Corpus Christi, Texas	575	23.0	178	0.8
Dallas, Texas	2,020	4.1	2,537	2.6
El Paso, Texas	1,488	82.5	81	0.3
Fort Worth, Texas	2,274	10.6	358	0.6
Houston, Texas	5,338	6.5	2,334	1.8
San Antonio, Texas	1,574	13.5	545	2.6
Granite, Salt Lake City, Utah	59	100.0	--	--
Fairfax, Virginia	3,322	100.0	--	--
Norfolk, Virginia	2,726	11.6	1,119	3.5
Richmond, Virginia	1,890	6.4	1,358	10.0
Tacoma, Wash.	2,613	73.9	424	1.3
Seattle, Wash.	5,757	55.5	1,455	1.9
Kanawha, Charleston, W. Virginia	2,905	81.9	394	0.8
Milwaukee, Wisc.	3,867	12.4	3,241	3.4

THE VARIETIES OF CHILDREN

One of the greatest educational handicaps under which minority children learn is the burden of a label. Negro children, for example, are often described as though they were all of a kind, each suffering identical handicaps, all following a single path of development. This sterotype ill-fits any group of children. It creates a special problem for the process of desegregation as parents and even some educators come to regard the minority children as uniformly poor academic achievers and antagonistic toward schools. Research does not support this misconception.

As long ago as 1930, Garth and colleagues tested 2,006 Negro children in Dallas, Tulsa, and several other urban Oklahoma places. At age 9.5 years, 48 percent of the Negro children overlapped the achievement scores of white children; 32 percent overlapped I.Q. scores of whites.[1] Over a period of time, the Negro-white gap widened.

The Pruitt-Igoe public housing project in St. Louis, Missouri, is inhabited by many very poor Negro families. In a study at the project, conducted by Ladner, it was found that school achievement was not highly valued. Yet, Ladner reports: "... In those families where the economic stability was largely absent but where parents still found the inner strength necessary to provide their daughters with the incentive to hope for a better life, adaptation to a future orientation had been achieved.... I observed many stable family situations existing among a large number of households in which a female was the head."[2] In such families, schooling plays an important part.

In an interracial public housing project on the Lower East Side of Manhattan, Volkman found that few Negro parents were of the poorest group.[3] They took what appeared to be a disproportionately active part in school affairs through the Parent-Teacher Association. On the other hand, in a study of the residents of a public housing project in Hunter's Point, San Francisco, we read an account of almost unrelieved antagonism between the school and the people.[1] Already by the 8th grade, Hippler reports, the dropout rate is 25 percent.[2]

---

[1] Thomas R. Garth, Bert E. Lovelady, and Hale W. Smith, "The Intelligence and Achievement of Southern Negro Children," School and Society, 32 (1930), p. 432.

[2] Joyce Ann Ladner, On Becoming a Woman in the Ghetto: Modes of Alienation (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1968), pp. 168, 198. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-17, 190)

[3] Jacob Volkman, The Informal Social Environment in a Public Housing Development: A Survey of the Social Behavior, the Attitudes, and the Feelings of Project Tenants Toward the Project and Its Population (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1966). (University Microfilms Order No. 67-127)

In two all-black kindergarten classes in Chicago, Ryckman studied the relationship between cognitive abilities and social class.[3] One hundred Negro middle and lower class boys were the subjects. On tests of the major cognitive components, the middle class boys scored higher. With respect to General Language Ability scores, "only 20 percent of the middle class children obtained component scores below the medians of the lower class group and only 16 percent of the lower class children had scores above the middle-class medians."[4]

Edna O. Meyers studied academic achievement among Negro boys in Harlem.[5] Two groups of twenty-three boys--achievers and underachievers--were analyzed. All were in the normal I.Q. range; the former were from somewhat more economically secure homes. Nevertheless, observed Meyers, "the lower-class subjects"--who were achieving two years under norm--"... were concerned with academic achievement; they were depressed by experience of failure, and this reaction to school seems very like that held by motivated middle class school children."[1]

---

[1] Arthur Edwin Hippler, Family Structure and Social Structure: Matrifocality in Hunter's Point (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1968), pp. 85-95, (University Microfilms Order No. 69-3613).

[2] Ibid., p. 90.

[3] David B. Ryckman, Psychological Processes of Disadvantaged Children (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-12, 417; and "A Comparison of Information Processing Abilities of Middle and Lower Class Negro Kindergarten Boys," Exceptional Children, 33 (1966-1967), 545-552.

[4] Ryckman, Psychological Processes of Disadvantaged Children, p. 59.

[5] Edna O. Meyers, Self-Concept, Family Structure and School Achievement: A Study of Disadvantaged Negro Boys (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-5540).

In Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Franks compared successful sixth grade Negro students with unsuccessful ones.[2] All were of 90 I.Q. or above and there was no significant difference in I.Q. score between the groups. Yet, a full year and a half difference in mean achievement separated the two. While the parents were roughly classed as "essentially laborers," the successful students did seem to come from a slightly higher group; still there was no essential difference between parents' education reported by both groups.

Goldstein and associates studied school children in a predominantly Negro area of New Jersey. They found both successful and unsuccessful students but were unable to identify any characteristics that sharply distinguished between those two subcategories of these generally disadvantaged youth.[3] "These young people," Goldstein and associates say, "are a far cry from the alienated products of disorganized homes of much popular pressure...."[4]

Fifth graders in ten central Harlem schools were studied by Davidson and Greenberg to discover differences between high and low achievers.[1] Only eight percent of 1,331 students tested scored above norm in reading and arithmetic. In the experimental group high achievers scored a reading test mean of 6.45 while the low achievers scored 2.85.[2] In comparing both groups on various psychological dimensions, Davidson and Greenberg found that high achievers were, among other things, superior in convergent thinking abilities, had more positive attitudes towards school, and benefited from higher parental concern for their education. The researchers conclude: "Rather than presenting a uniform picture of deficiency, our sample of Negro children from a severely deprived environment exhibited considerable variability."[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 64 (emphasis in original).

[2] Bonita B. Franks, Some Social Determinants of Academic Success Among Culturally Disadvantaged Negro Children (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-8688).

[3] Bernard Goldstein, Harry C. Bredemeier, William M. Phillips, Jr. and Coralie Farlee, Social and Cultural Factors Related to School Achievement, June, 1967, p.IV-1 (ERIC # ED 014 763)

[4] Ibid.

In a central North Carolina city, Harris equated the I. Q. scores of 591 Negro and 570 white fifth-graders.[4] All the scores were grouped into five "levels": Level I-70 and below; Level II-71 to 85; Level III-86 to 100; Level IV-101 to 115; and Level V-116 and higher. Mean I.Q. score for Negroes was 91.6; for whites, 104.2. Then, a series of achievement tests was administered. Here is the distribution of achievement grade equivalents of children in the five I.Q. levels:[5]

I.Q. Level	Negro	White
1	3.7	3.6
2	3.9	4.4
3	4.4	4.9

---

[1] Helen H. Davidson and Judith W. Greenberg, Traits of School Achievers from a Deprived Background, (May, 1967) (ERIC (ERIC # ED 013 849).

[2] Ibid., p. 18.

[3] Ibid., p. 113.

[4] Gary Reeves Harris, A Study of the Academic Achievement of Selected Negro and White Fifth-Grade Pupils When Educational Ability Is Held Constant (Doctoral dissertation dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-6783).

[5] Ibid., p. 69.

I. Q. Level	Negro	White
4	5.2	6.0
5	5.8	7.7

Note that for both racial groups, only the children on I. Q. levels 4 and 5 achieved normal or higher grade placement. Part, at least, of the racial differences on those two levels probably can be explained by socio-economic differences. (Harris did not control for this factor.)

At the Institute for Juvenile Research in Chicago, two teams of researchers are investigating cognitive and achievement-related behavior among Negro children. Solomon and associates have interviewed seventy-two sets of Negro parents of fifth grade children.[1] While all the families share a lower class status, they exhibit a variety of parental styles.

The Solomon team suspects that study of such factors will produce "better achievement than that which has been produced in studies using more global approaches."[2] Borowitz and Hirsch are studying thirty-two four-year-old Negro boys living in a public housing project in the same general area of the city.[3] They have succeeded in constructing a typology of cognitive potential in which three classes of cognitive differentiation are distinguished. On the basis of their intensive clinical study of the boys, they predict school achievement as follows:[4]

---

[1] Daniel Solomon, Robert J. Parelius, and Thomas V. Busse, Dimensions of Achievement-Related Behavior Among Lower-Class Negro Parents (ERIC # ED 021 004).

[2] Ibid., p. 24.

[3] Gene H. Borowitz and Jay G. Hirsch, A Development Typology of Disadvantaged Four-Year-Olds (Chicago: Institute for Juvenile Research, March 21, 1968).

[4] Ibid., p. 14.

Excellent	9
Good	10
Fair	6
Poor	7

No follow-up study has yet been published.

Entwisle and Greenberger found that Negro and white first-graders in the Baltimore inner city were "more advanced linguistically than white suburban children... in terms of paradigmatic responses...."[1] The reason, they surmised was that the children learned verbal material from watching television. By third grade, however, the suburban children had higher scores on the word association test administered earlier. In Detroit, Sigel and Olmstead restudied a group of Head Start children one year after completion of a one-month summer program. With respect to cognitive skills, the authors observe that "the considerable variability of these children indicate that they are not of the same cloth in spite of commonality in economic and social position."[2] Bereiter described his experience in teaching disadvantaged Negro children in an intensive project of compensatory education in the Champaign, Illinois area. He denied that any rote learning was going on, saying: "They are taught to figure these things out. And in so doing they display the verve, agility, and persistence that would ordinarily signal an I. Q. in the superior range."[3]

---

[1] Doris R. Entwisle and Ellen Greenberger, Differences in the Language of Negro and White Grade School Children 1, 2 (May, 1968) p. 1 (ERIC # ED 019 676).

[2] Irving E. Sigel and Patricia Olmsted, Modification of Cognitive Skills among Lower-Class Negro Children: A Follow-Up Training Study, August, 1968, p. 32.

[3] Carl Bereiter, "A Nonpsychological Approach to Early Compensatory Education," in Social Class, Race and Psychological Development ed. by Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz, and Arthur R. Jensen (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), p. 344.

Mackler followed the entire school progress of a group of students now attending a Harlem high school. His principal interest was in the effects of ability grouping. "... Initially," Mackler noted, "there are vast differences in the training children bring to school."[1] For better or worse, he reported: "... A ghetto school functions no differently from white middle class schools. Those who can do what is expected are rewarded and are encouraged to move ahead."[2]

Offenbacher studied children in four schools--Bayview and Market Street, lower-class schools in New York City; Prospect Hill, a lower class school in Baltimore; and High Towers, a middle class private school in New York City. Among the lower class students she found a fundamental distinguishing characteristic to be the "ability to correctly perceive and respond to the requirements of their social world, and to evidence 'social competence' in interpersonal situations."[3] Schools, Offenbacher insists, should pay more attention to within-subculture differences than to between-culture differences. An emphasis on the former leads to an over-concern with 'cultural traits' that often strike the school as entirely unresistant. An emphasis on the latter, however, might lead to an understanding of specific factors that distinguish successful from unsuccessful students in the same milieu. Such factors may be more readily manipulable by the school and community.

In virtually each of the foregoing studies, the subjects attended segregated, inner-city schools. One may speculate on the even-greater emergence of differences all along the ability range that might result from substantially improved education in a desegregated context.

Singh studied the creativity of one hundred Negro and

---

1. Bernard Mackler, "Grouping in the Ghetto," Education and Urban Society, 2 (1969), p. 84.

2. Ibid., p. 93.

3. Deborah I. Offenbacher, Cultures in Conflict. Home and School as Seen Through the Eyes of Lower Class Students, (January, 1969), p. 92.

white first and sixth graders in Tampa, Florida. After controlling for socioeconomic status, he found relatively small differences between racial groups. On certain subtests he found significant differences favoring the more disadvantaged children. "The supposed inferiority on verbal tasks for low economic status," Singh found, "was not substantiated. Disadvantaged children seemed less inhibited and more of an explorer type."[1]

In Denver, Colorado, Jackson studied the reasoning ability of 240 Negro and white ninth grade children in terms of Guilford's concepts of convergent and divergent thinking. Intelligence and socioeconomic status were controlled. While differences on all tests were statistically significant in favor of the white children, Jackson pointed out that the actual mean scores were not far apart. On tests of convergent thinking, mean scores for white and Negroes were 11.96 and 10.08; of divergent thinking, 23.82 and 21.23.[2]

ARE NEGRO CHILDREN A BLOC?

We have seen the inaccuracy of regarding all Negro children as identical in capacity and academic performance. There is another, related belief--viz., that while Negro children may differ among themselves, they can be grouped together in relation to white children. Over many years, common sensical conclusions and research findings have accumulated in support of this belief. Only recently have contrary findings started to enter the literature in force. Some of these are reviewed below.

---

[1] Surendra Pratap Singh, A Comparison Between Privileged Negroes, Underprivileged Negroes, Privileged Whites, and Underprivileged White Children on a Test of Creativity (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1967), p. 69. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-232).

[2] Anne Mae Jackson, Differential Characteristics of Reasoning Ability in Negroes and Whites (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University, 1967), p. 54. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-2604).

An often-repeated proposition is that Negro children are "motoric" and can learn better through means involving physical movement. Chief of these media is programmed learning. A rare test was performed by Rodgers. He tested black school children in a geography classroom in Fayetteville, North Carolina. He concluded: "There is some evidence that pupils learn facts and concepts about longitude and latitude more effectively from a flexible method of presentation than from a programmed method."[1]

In a rural area of Northeastern Georgia, Richmond tested the creative thinking ability of seventy Negro and white segregated eighth-graders. Test scores of whites exceeded those of Negroes in verbal and non-verbal intelligence. On creativity, however, results were mixed: "White students were superior on verbal fluency, verbal flexibility, figural flexibility, and figural originality. There were no significant differences between white and Negro on verbal originality and Negroes scored higher on figural elaboration."[2] Richmond speculates that the higher Negro score on figural elaboration involves "a high sensitivity in observation."[3] Asks the researcher: "Is it ... possible that their experiences have made them more sensitive observers of the human scene?"[4] Gitter and Black report on an experiment in Boston: "Black perceivers were significantly better judges of emotion than their white counterparts."[5]

Tulkin sought ways to neutralize social class in a comparison of 389 Negro and white fifth and sixth graders in a suburban Maryland school system. He succeeded in part by taking into account more than socioeconomic status as measured by education and occupation of head of the household; he also included various aspects of the home environment, such as crowdedness, family intactness, and maternal employment. Viewing class in this comprehensive way, Tulkin found no achievement differences between upper socioeconomic whites and Negroes.[1] He has yet to "equate" social class between lower-class Negroes and whites.

---

[1] Frederick A. Rodgers, "Gain in Programmed and Flexible Presentations," Elementary School Journal, 68 (1967-1968), 321.

[2] Bert O. Richmond, Creative and Cognitive Abilities of White and Negro Children, 1968, p. 4 (ERIC # ED 030 922).

[3] Ibid., p. 5.

[4] Ibid., p. 6.

[5] A. George Gitter and Harvey Black, Expression and Perception of Emotion: Race and Sex, May, 1968, p. 34 (ERIC # ED 029 313).

The obduracy of the problem of a statistical equivalence of Negro-white lower class is underscored by Kennedy. In 1965, he re-tested part of a sample of the Southeastern United States Negro child population. These children were in segregated schools. In the period 1960-1965, he found, I.Q. had remained unchanged.[2] (In an earlier, preliminary report he had reported that I.Q. fell as the child grew older. In his latest study, however, Kennedy explains that this finding was an artifact of sampling).[3] Academic achievement continued to decline so that by the tenth grade, the average child lagged by three years.[4] Some four out of five of this group fall into the lowest socioeconomic level. "Thus," declares Kennedy, "when one speaks of the Negro child, he is talking about a socioeconomically deprived child who is Negro, and the relative weights of these two determinants cannot be isolated."[5]

---

[1] Steven R. Tulkin, "Race, Class, Family and School Achievement," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9 (1968) 35.

[2] Wallace A. Kennedy, A Follow-Up Normative Study of Negro Intelligence and Achievement (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 18.

[3] Ibid., p. 21.

[4] Ibid., p. 23.

[5] Ibid., p. 21.

While the problem is a difficult scientific one, the question remains whether it is an educational one at all. That is, does it matter in the classroom whether one can isolate race from class in the areas of intelligence and achievement? Can any educational outcome hinge on it?

ETHNIC LEARNING STYLES?

In 1965, Lesser and associates sought to discover the relative importance of ethnic and social class factors in cognitive functioning among children in the New York City area.[1] With reference to mean scores for verbal, reasoning, numerical, and spatial components of mental ability; Chinese, Jewish, Negro, and Puerto Rican children fell into distinctive patterns, in the following order:

Verbal: Jewish, Negro, Chinese, Puerto Rican
Reasoning: Chinese, Jewish, Negro, Puerto Rican
Numerical: Jewish, Chinese, Puerto Rican, Negro
Spatial: Chinese, Jewish, Puerto Rican, Negro

It was also found that within each ethnic group, middle class children scored consistently higher than lower class children. Nevertheless, the ethnic patterns were far more striking than the social class patterns. As for the practical educational consequences of these findings, the authors stated in 1965 that "we have not yet attempted to relate these patterns of ability to school performance."[2] Two years later, the researchers again observed that "we do not yet know if attribute patterns associated with ethnic-group membership will, in fact, be identified as educationally important."[3]

In Hawaii, two studies are relevant to the possible educational importance of ethnic and social factors in mental ability and achievement.

---

[1] Gerald S. Lesser, Gordon Fifer, and Donald H. Clark, Mental Abilities of Children from Different Social-Class and Cultural Groups (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).

[2] Ibid., p. 79.

[3] Susan S. Stodolsky and Gerald S. Lesser, "Learning Patterns in the Disadvantaged," Harvard Educational Review (1967), p. 587.

Stewart and associates studied tenth graders in Hawaii and tested them in December, 1960 and April, 1963, when they were in the twelfth grade.[1] Both mental ability and academic achievement were tested. Japanese and Chinese students scored highest; Caucasians, next highest; Filipinos next, and Hawaiians lowest. Over the twenty-eight month period, mean scores increased for all ethnic groups, except the Hawaiians.[2] Unfortunately, the ethnic effect was beclouded by the free interplay of a number of significant factors. The researchers mention that "these cultural groups vary widely with respect to factors such as tradition, degree of acculturation, family customs, and speech habits."[3] Many teachers in Hawaii, it is observed, are Orientals.

A rare longitudinal study of 635 children in Hawaii was conducted by Werner and associates.[4] Six hundred thirty-five children born in 1955 were tested at age two and then again eight years later. At the earlier age, Japanese children had the highest mean I.Q. score (103) and Filipinos the lowest (95). Socioeconomic differences did not seem to affect these scores. At age 10, Caucasian children scored highest (112), Japanese children second (109), and Portuguese lowest (96), On a scale of school achievement problems, Caucasian and Japanese children had the least; Hawaiians and Filipinos the most. At the later age, socioeconomic influences left mental ability and

---

1. Lawrence H. Stewart, Arthur A. Dole, and Yeuell Y. Harris, "Cultural Differences in Abilities During High School," American Education Research Journal, 4 (1967)

2. Ibid., p. 27.

3. Ibid., p. 21.

4. Emmy E. Werner, Kenneth Simonian, and Ruth S. Smith, Ethnic and Socioeconomic Status Differences in Abilities and Achievement Among Preschool and School-Age Children in Hawaii," Journal of Social Psychology, 75 (1968).

achievement unaffected. Thus, Werner and associates stress the coherence and stability of the ethnic factor. On the other hand, they pointed to parental stimulation received at home as a major factor. "In the majority of the Japanese homes emphasis is placed on the value of education, on disciplined work habits, and esteem for intellectual pursuits, even where the parents may not have had much education."[1] Ethnic style was seen by the researchers as an aspect of the family rather than as a psychological structure.

Smith studied the possible presence of ethnic learning styles in the Job Corps.[2] He visited the Job Corps Centers at Harpers Ferry, Schenck, Wellfleet and Kilmer; and two vocational high schools in Baltimore, one all-black, the other eighty-six percent white. He concluded that ethnic styles were apparent only; upon close examination, they disappeared. As Smith explained:[3]

> When the proportion of Negroes is low, Negroes group together and maintain low interaction rates with other members of the group. They exhibit sterotypic behaviors, rhythms, slowness, docility, highly slurred, dialect speech, etc. When the proportion is high, Negro behavior differs.... Interaction with others is greatly increased. The sterotypic behaviors disappear and in their place are substituted highly political, power-conscious behaviors.

In the predominantly white school in Baltimore, Smith found, Negro students were treated equally and responded in typical "good student" style. The matter was quite otherwise in the other school in which no real achievement was expected of students, and none resulted.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 55.

[2] D. B. Smith, Report on Differences in Ethnic Learning Styles, 1966 (ERIC # ED 015 253).

[3] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[4] Ibid., p. 58.

Lesser and associates had found, among other things, that ethnic style was more important than social class and that social class had its greatest effect on mental abilities of Negro children. On both counts, Sitkei came to different conclusions.[1] Comparing fifty white and Negro middle and lower class children, averaging four years of age, he found that "ethnic and social class categories affected the group profiles in an equal fashion."[2] On only one out of the six factors in Guilford's Structure of Intellect was there a greater social class effect for Negro children than for white children.

Burnes, in a study of 78 Negro and white children in St. Louis, averaging 8.5 years of age, found that "there is no evidence in favor of Stodolsky and Lesser's suggestion of patterns of abilities within cultural-racial groups. In fact... configurations of scores are more similar for socioeconomic classes."[3]

The case for an ethnic style that is salient in the classroom has yet to be established. Later, however, we shall see how ideological misuse is being made of the concept of ethnic cognitive style. (see pp.373-375.)

THE TOOLS OF INQUIRY

To measure desegregation effects, one must have tools adequate to the job. Ideally, the testing instruments should be neutral to color and class. The literature of desegregation research is filled with references to certain instruments that are used very widely. In the past several years, researchers have started to cast doubt on the neutrality of even the most widely-used of these instruments. Following are some critical conclusions reached by scholars in this field.

---

[1] Emil George Sitkei, Comparative Structure of Intellect in Middle and Lower-Class Four-Year-Old Children of Two Ethnic Groups (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966) University Microfilms Order No. 67-5310).

[2] Ibid., p. 100.

[3] Donna Key Standley Burnes, A Study of Relationships Between Measured Intelligence and Non-Intellective Factors for Children of Two Socioeconomic Groups and Races (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1968), p.63 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-8989).

New scoring standards for the Goodenough Draw a Man Test of intelligence were recently drawn up to meet criticism. A study by Muzekari questions the fairness of even the new standards.[1] Milgram and Ozer compared certain aspects of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary and Stanford Binet test scores and concluded that "... an impoverished environment may have a greater impact on PPVT performance than on SB performance in pre-school children."[2] Cohen found that lower-class Negro boys were penalized on nonverbal intelligence tests that consist of abstract shapes and figures.[3] She explained that lower-class styles of thought are predominantly relational. Thus, concepts take form only when the lower-class person is able to connect the subject matter of a problem with his own experience. Inasmuch as the test example lacks any subject matter, the lower-class person will be all the less able to conceptualize.

Tulkin and Newbrough evaluated the extent to which the very widely-used Raven (1956) Standard Progressive

---

[1] Louis H. Muzekari, "Relationships Between the Goodenough DAM And Stanford-Binet in Negro and White Public School Children," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 23 (1967) 87.

[2] Norman A. Milgram and Mark N. Ozer, "Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Scores of Pre-School Children," Psychological Reports, 20 (1967) 783.

[3] Rosalie Cohen, "The Relation between Socioconceptual styles and Orientation to School Requirements," Sociology of Education, 41 (1968) 208.

Matrices Test was not dependent on culture. While it was not culture-free, it proved to be more "culture-fair" than some other intelligence tests. Nevertheless, controlling for race and class, but the latter especially, reduced the differences in scores between test-takers.[1] Lower-class Negro children make lower scores than middle-class white children on the Lorge-Thorndike intelligence test. Whiteman and Deutsch point out that the test shows the social class deficit sooner and among children of a broad range of age. On the other hand, the race deficit shows up later and especially for older children.[2]

Two very widely used tests of achievement are the Metropolitan and the Iowa. Eagle and Harris reported: "While white pupils earned higher average scores than non-white pupils on both tests, the Metropolitan produced a greater discrepancy between the races than did the Iowa."[3]

One of the most widely used tests is the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC). Nalven and associates polled a number of clinical psychologists as to their view of the validity of WISC scores. Respondents indicated that they "assume that lower class and Negro children's obtained WISC I. Q. scores represent significant underestimates of their true intellectual capacities."[4]

---

1. Steven R. Tulkin and J. R. Newbrough, "Social Class, Race, and Sex Differences on the Raven (1956) Standard Progressive Matrices, "Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32 (1968) 405.

2. Martin Whiteman and Martin Deutsch, "Social Disadvantage as Related to Intellective and Language Development," in Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development, ed. by Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz and Arthur R. Jensen (New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1968), p. 113.

3. Norman Eagle and Anna S. Harris, "Interaction of Race and Test on Reading Performance Scores," Journal of Educational Measurement, Fall, 1969, p. 132.

4. Frederic B. Nalven, Louis J. Hofmann, and Bruce Bierbryer, "The Effects of Subjects' Age, Sex, Race, and Socioeconomic Status on Psychologists' Estimates of 'True IQ' from WISC Scores," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 25 (1969) 274.

Fundamental to study of interracial school performance is a technique of isolating the effects of social class. The problem is that such a satisfactory technique has yet to be devised. Researchers most often equate occupation, income, and/or education of parents with social class. Williams has recently held: "Current social class indices are constructed on the basis of social stratification configurations characteric of the white community. The particular and unique conditions of the Negro community are unaccounted for by these indices."[1] Education, for example, is much more closely linked with prestige in the Negro community than is the case in white society. Inasmuch as income differentials are fewer in the Negro community, it is not income so much as patterns of expenditure that are connected with social class in that community. Williams declares it a contradiction that the Negro lower class should supply so many college students. Within the system of Negro stratification, this would seem to be quite understandable. (See below, pp. 107-109)

The Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test (WADT) is a standard measure of the ability to distinguish between English phonemes. It thus enters prominently into assessing a child's verbal ability. Berlin and Dill used the WADT with 45 Negro and white third graders in the inner city of Baltimore. After finding the scores of the Negro children very low, the test was re-administered accompanied by admonitory help. Negro scores improved significantly. "From our own work," note the researchers, "admonishing instructions and positive reinforcement seem appropriate on the second trial."[1]

---

[1] Jay Reigle Williams, Social Stratification and the Negro American: An Exploration of Some Problems in Social Class Measurement (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1968), p. 2 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-14, 338).

These few examples illustrate the need to examine the tools of analysis before proceeding to analyze the main subject matter at hand. In the field of race and schools this seems especially important.

TOPICS OF ANALYSIS

Negro children usually appear in the desegregation process as passive partners in learning. They are the ones who are transferred or bused. They are the ones who, if at all, receive special services in the new school. Yet, the passivity is only apparent. Under conditions of change their self-awareness is aroused. How do Negro children add up these experiences? What happens to their self-conceptions? Are they overwhelmed by new challenges and driven to self-depreciation? These are some of the leading issues of desegregation research reviewed here.

Another set of problems revolves around the topic of academic achievement by children of sharply differing socioeconomic levels. Much of the recorded desegregation has not been of the type that would draw together such students. In many cases, the socioeconomic status of Negro and white is similar. It is perhaps of more interest, however, to observe contrasting cases. A related problem is the impact of busing on achievement. Inasmuch as busing of physically handicapped or of geographically isolated children has not been known to affect achievement, it is of interest to see if the same holds for interracial busing. A final problem of interest is the impact of ability grouping or academic tracking on achievement. As we will see, this is a topic well worth the study.

How do Negro and white students get on as schoolmates? In class sessions, in extra-curricular activites, in informal socializing, the racial factor is at work. The real question is whether and to what extent desegregation has overcome it. With desegregation can we look forward to more than civility between children of different ethnic groups? Teachers are another dimension of the desegregation situation. To what extent have they played a leadership role, following or lagging behind dominant community opinion?

---

[1] Charles I. Berlin and Anne C. Dill, "The Effects of Feedback and Positive Reinforcement on the Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test Scores of Lower-Class Negro and White Children," Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 10 (1967) 389.

Desegregation concerns ethnic minorities other than Negroes. A sampling of studies of Mexican-American and Indian American children in desegregation situations is examined. In some ways, the burdens of being a minority child in a white-centered culture are common to these children and to Negro children. Poverty and powerlessness are poor preparation for equal-status contact. On the other hand, cultural differences distinguish the minority children. Indian Americans are not, that is, Red Negroes.

It is curious how little reaches the pages of formal studies of the daily life and attitudes in Negro American communities. Numerous studies are made of white attitudes toward Negroes, of reaction of whites to the prospect of school desegregation, or of strategies for changing white attitudes. Negro life is thus viewed as a resultant of other forces rather than an autonomous factor on its own. In Chapter 8 are brought together the findings of a number of studies that may help the reader bring a certain coherence to the subject.

While an entire chapter is devoted to an examination of the factual basis of the anti-desegregation position, two topics are not discussed: (1) whether Negroes have an inferior intelligence by birth, and (a) whether the U.S. Supreme Court had an adequate scientific basis for the Brown decision in 1954. Endless controversy surrounds both points. The present writer has never seen evidence that convinces him of the inborn inferiority of any race of people; full-length explorations of the question can be found elsewhere. Both questions--"inferior" intelligence and the 1954 ruling--

are quite irrevelant to the present concern. In this work the central question is: Desegregation occurred; what were the results?

Veblen once wrote: "So it is something of a homiletical commonplace to say that the outcome of any serious research can only be to make two questions grow where one question grew before."[1] And so in the present case, as well. Research into desegregation has gone far beyond the simplicities of single queries and replies. It is, however, a matter of some personal gratification to note that the proliferous progress of research supports confidence in the creative potentials of our fellow men.

---

[1] Thorstein Veblen, "The Evolution of the Scientific Point of View," in The Place of Science in Modern Civilization and Other Essays (New York: Viking, 1942), p. 33.

CHAPTER 2

DESEGREGATION AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

How has racial desegregation affected academic achievement? To answer this question, a number of empirical inquiries into actual classroom desegregation are reviewed and presented in this chapter.[1] The findings of each study are reported and, if it is an extensive study, an assessment is made of its procedure and method. From time to time indications are made of the interrelations of two or more studies. Special attention is paid the emergence of certain central questions in the history of desegregation research.

What is a study? Any scholarly attempt to discover the truth about a subject. In this connection, scholarship means careful and disciplined inquiry rather than formal behavior said to be peculiar to universities. Accordingly, this chapter deals with a very broad range of studies, many of them academic in origin, but some not.

First a group of studies is considered which report on academic achievement under racially segregated conditions. Second, several studies are examined in which the situations are bi-racial but which exhibit no special concern for stimulating desegregation. Third, the heart of the chapter, a group of more or less controlled studies of desegregated situations are presented. This section represents the most extensive examination of its kind. Fourth, a few studies of busing are analyzed. And fifth, some summary statements are made

---

1. Several experimental studies of desegregation, especially by Katz, are considered in the following chapter inasmuch as they seem more relevant to the problem of constructing a theory of desegregation.

about the research value of various formal program evaluations that were conducted in New York City.

I. Learning Under Segregated Conditions

Around the time of the 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision, numerous school systems started to publish achievement test scores of Negro and white students. Without exception, the results showed a very large gap between the two. These discrepancies, it should be recalled, existed after more than a half century of a theoretical "separate-but-equal" national school policy.

During 1953-1954, the Texas Association of School Administrators surveyed achievement of eighty percent of that state's school children. "In most cases," it was reported, "the achievement of white pupils as measured by standard test scores was very satisfactory; most Negro pupils were performing unsatisfactorily when judgments were made on the basis of tests."[1] In 1950, a survey in Dade County, Florida, of arithmetic achievement by eighth graders found white children ahead of national norms while Negro children lagged by two years.[2] Negro sixth graders in Nashville were more than two years behind white students in overall achievement.[3]

In the North, the situation was far from satisfactory. During 1954, for example, Ferguson and Plaut surveyed the senior classes of thirty-two public high schools in eleven northern states. Out of a total of 10,388 seniors, about a third--3,337--were Negroes. Only 24 of these 3,337 were in the upper quarter of their class and could offer the necessary minimum number of college admission units.[4] In New York

---

[1] Southern School News, October 1, 1954, p. 13.

[2] Ibid., July, 1956, p.2.

[3] Ibid., December, 1956, p.5.

[4] Harold A. Ferguson and Richard L. Plaut, "Talent: To Develop or to Lose," Educational Record, April, 1954, p. 138.

City, during November, 1959, half of all seventh-grade pupils were reading more than two years below level;[1] a majority of these children were Negroes and Puerto Ricans. Four years later, over eighty percent of sixth graders in central Harlem schools were reading below level.[2] Landers has reported that in 1966 "the typical Central Harlem student in grade 5 was retarded one year and one month."[3]

In 1960, Kennedy and his associates surveyed a large sample of Negro children in the southeastern states. They found the mean I.Q. to be 80.7, as contrasted with a "normal" score of 100.[4] Achievement, as measured by standardized group tests, was found to follow this pattern of progressive relative decline. A restudy, five years later, found the pattern to be undisturbed. I. Q. trends remained as they had been and achievement declines continued so that "the amount of retardation at the tenth-grade level is quite severe."[5]

Evidence is contradictory as to the universality among Negro youth of progressive relative declines in I.Q.

---

[1] Jacob Landers, Higher Horizons Progress Report (New York: Board of Education, 1963), p. 9.

[2] Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., Youth in the Ghetto: A Study of the Consequences of Powerlessness and a Blueprint for Change (New York.: HARYOU, 1946), pp. 168-170. This was a test of reading comprehension.

[3] Jacob Landers, "A Letter to the Editor," Integrated Education, (February-March, 1967), pp. 48-49.

[4] Wallace A. Kennedy, V. Van de Riet, and James C. White, The Standardization of the 1960 Revising of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale on Negro Elementary School Children in the Southeastern United States (Tallahassee: Human Development Clinic, Florida State University, 1961), pp. 144, 146.

[5] Wallace A. Kennedy, "A Follow-up Normative Study of Negro Intelligence and Achievement," unpublished paper read to the 1966 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, pp. 11, 16.

In central Harlem during 1964, median I.Q. scores declined somewhat as follows:[1]

Grade	Median I.Q.
3	90.6
6	86.3
8	87.7

A year earlier, Schreiber characterized "the average Harlem child:" "In grade 3, his I.Q. score is a little below 100; in grade 6, it is in the low 90's; in grade 8, it is in the low 80's."[2]

Two studies fail to support the thesis of progressive relative decline.

Harris and Lovinger followed the record of I.Q. scores for eighty Negro students in New York City. The difference between the first grade and the ninth grade means of the same children (97.6 and 96.0) was not statistically significant.[3] Scott studied the I.Q. record of sixty-five Negro students in Chicago and found that mean I.Q. had fallen between first and ninth grades from 93.06 to 89.92.[4] While statistically significant (at the five percent level), this difference is very small indeed; in addition, two different I.Q. tests were used between grades and one cannot therefore make too much of this relatively small change. The Harris and Lovinger and the Scott studies are truly longitudinal, i.e., the subjects are the same ones during the periods of comparison. On the other hand, the studies that argue for the universality of progressive relative decline are cross-sectional, i.e., the subjects are different ones along the continuum and so changes in any of them are not, in fact, recorded. Sometimes this distinction is difficult to discover. Deutsch and Brown, for example, assert about their sample, that "within the Negro lower-class, there is a consistent decrement in I.Q. level from the first to fifth grade."[1] It would seem that they are not speaking of the same children over a period of five years.

---

[1] HARYOU, Youth in the Ghetto, p. 179.

[2] Daniel Schreiber in Invitational Conference on Northern School Desegregation, Proceedings (New York: Yeshiva University, 1962), pp. 46-47.

[3] Albert J. Harris and Robert J. Lovinger, Some Longitudinal Data on I.Q. Changes in the Intelligence of Negro Adolescents (New York: City University of New York, 1967) p.2.

[4] Ralph Scott, "First to Ninth Grade I.Q. Changes of Northern Negro Students, "Psychology in the Schools, April, 1966, p. 159.

While the career of I.Q. scores may be indeterminate, this is far from the case when it comes to the matter of academic achievement. There is an almost universally acknowledged drop in academic achievement among Negro school children as they "progress" in school. Whether the research procedure is longitudinal or cross-sectional, the result is the same. Harris and Lovinger found that their subjects--who had not lost in I.Q. scores--nevertheless lagged one and a half years behind the achievement norm for seventh grade.

Long found the same to be sure in a study of Washington, D.C. Negro third graders.[2] "The signs indicate," according to Long, "that there is a tendency in our groups for scores in intelligence and achievement to vary inversely.... One must consider the possibility of accounting for the difference in terms of environment or miseducation."[3]

In the main, the low I.Q. and achievement scores of Negro children just reviewed have occurred in a context of segregation. Does attendance at racially mixed schools bring about any changes in I.Q. and achievement? The remainder of this chapter deals with this question. In the next part we examine studies and/or reports of bi-racial school situations which are reviewed for their unplanned effect, if any, on Negro learning. In the third part, we analyze the findings of controlled research studies of desegregation and the effects upon learning.

---

[1] Martin Deutsch and Bert Brown, "Social Influences in Negro-White Intelligence Differences," Journal of Social Issues, (April, 1964), p. 30.

[2] Howard H. Long, "Test Results of Third-Grade Negro Children Selected on the Basis of Socioeconomic Status, 1, "Journal of Negro Education, IV (1935)

[3] Ibid., p. 551.

II. Learning in Bi-Racial School Situations

In 1913, Mayo made a study of the school grades of Negro and white students in two New York City high schools. While he found no very great differences between the two groups, nevertheless he reported: "Relative retardation... would seem to be characteristic of the high school colored group.... The colored pupils are about three-quarters as efficient as the whites in the pursuit of high school studies."[1] Yet, white students were more likely to become dropouts.[2]

Witty and Decker studied Negro and white achievement in the schools of Coffeyville, Kansas.[3] The sample included 1,725 white and 220 Negro students. The latter scored consistently lower on a battery of achievement tests. The smallest gap, however, was on a test of history and literature. The researchers remarked: "The success of the children upon this test suggests that the Negroes studied must be functioning far below capacity in many school subjects."[4]

Crowley compared Negro achievement in segregated and non-segregated schools in Cincinnati.[1] Two groups of 55 Negro children were selected from two segregated and four non-segregated schools. The groups were equated as to grades, age, mental age, and I.Q. scores. Students were not specifically matched by socioeconomic measures although Crowley stated that "the school records and social histories indicated that the groups were equated in respect to... social status...."[2] A battery of standard achievement tests was administered. Students in the non-segregated schools scored significantly higher in writing and spelling. In the remaining tests, no significant differences were found.

---

[1] Marion Jacob Mayo, "The Mental Capacity of the American Negro," reprinted from the Archives of Psychology, No. 28, (November, 1913, pp. 25 and 45.

[2] Ibid., p. 21.

[3] Paul A. Witty and A. I. Decker, "A Comparative Study of the Educational Attainment of Negro and White Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, XVIII, (1927).

[4] Ibid., p. 500.

A study of the Portland, Oregon high schools divided Negro and non-Negro students according to grades and the racial and social composition of the elementary schools they had attended. Seniors who had earned a grade point average of "C" or higher were classified as follows:[3]

	Racial and social composition of elementary school				
Students	25% or more Negro	5-24% Negro	Lower income white	Middle income white	High income white
Negro	32%	38%	8%	33%	0
Non-Negro	70%	69%	70%	76%	85%

---

[1] Mary R. Crowley, "Cincinnati's Experiment in Negro Education: A Comparative Study of the Segregated and Mixed School," Journal of Negro Education, 1 (1932). A critique of this study can be found in Howard Hale Long, "Some Psychogenic Hazards of Segregated Education of Negroes," Journal of Negro Education, IV (1935).

[2] Ibid., p. 31.

[3] Committee on Race and Education, Race and Equal Educational Opportunity in Portland's Public Schools (Portland, Oregon: Board of Education, Oct. 29, 1964, p. 113.

The study concluded that Negro achievement was benefited by attendance at schools with relatively more whites and middle class students. This conclusion seems best supported with respect to the learning benefits of attendance at middle class rather than lower class white schools. The difference between schools of varying racial percentages does not seem to be of unquestioned significance. Finally, the study is based on classroom grades rather than objective test scores and is for that reason alone to be treated cautiously.

Clark and Plotkin studied the academic record of 519 Negro students who had been helped financially through integrated colleges by the National Scholarship Service and the Fund for Negro Students. These 519 students had attended college during 1952 and 1956. Their college aptitude, as measured by SAT, was below the average of the national college population; yet, significantly more of them completed college with at least average grades than did the general college population.[1] Clark and Plotkin stress that "the academic performance of these students is far beyond the level that would be indicated by such predictive devices as college board scores, family income, and educational background."[2]

Negro students from southern high schools earned higher college grades than did graduates of northern high schools. The researchers suggest four alternative explanations without supporting or rejecting any: (1) northern high schools are inferior, (2) southern students are more highly motivated, (3) some kind of intellectual selectivity among southern high school students, or (4) a combination of these factors. Whatever the reason, however, these students are undoubted examples of Negroes who were able to function satisfactorily under the same intellectual standards as white youth. Nor did educational success diminish their racial identification. They were a highly select group.

---

[1] Kenneth B. Clark and Lawrence Plotkin, The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges (New York: National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1963), p. 26.

[2] Ibid., p. 21.

Bindman studied a considerably less select group. These were 154 males of the 326 Negro students on the main campus (Urbana) of the University of Illinois.[1] Nearly half the larger total was composed of graduates of Chicago high schools. As in the case of the Clark-Plotkin sample, the University of Illinois Negro students were performing academically at a higher level than could have been predicted by precollege test scores. Unlike the Clark-Plotkin sample, however, these students were twice as likely as white students to be marginal performers.[2] Only about one-sixth of the 154 Negro students were able to earn a "C+" average and thus remain in good standing in most university curricula.[3]

Student performance at the university seemed unrelated either to socioeconomic background or to attendance at a predominantly Negro high school. Bindman discovered that Negro students from more advantaged homes were not better prepared.[4] Some seventy percent of the students fell below the fiftieth percentile of all students enrolled in their department. To Bindman, this indicated that "students from both 'integrated' and predominantly Negro high schools came inadequately prepared for college."[5] At no level of academic performance were the records of Negro students distinguishable from one another on the criterion of having attended segregated or presumably non-segregated schools.[6]

---

[1] Aaron M. Bindman, Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinios, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 65-7076).

[2] Ibid., p. 67.

[3] Ibid., p. 65.

[4] Ibid., p. 93.

[5] Ibid., p. 85.

[6] See, also, Aaron Bindman, "Pre-College Preparation of Negro College Students," Journal of Negro Education, (Fall, 1966).

The dynamics of poor Negro scholastic performance were described by Bindman as essentially a social-psychological process of on-campus alienation. This phenomenon is examined in greater detail in the next chapter.

Johnson and his colleagues studied the academic adequacy of Chicago high schools from which University of Illinois Negro and white students graduated. They compared grade-point averages earned at the university (at the Chicago Circle Campus) with the racial composition of the high school. Here is a summary of this finding:[1]

Race of Students	Grade Point Average of Students Graduating From: Predominantly white high school	Predominantly Negro high school
Negro	2.78	2.45
White	3.40	2.75

Thus, those Negro and white students performed best who had come from a predominantly white high school. It should be kept in mind that the basic data in this study are grade-point averages which do not bear great weight when drawing fine distinction between groups of students.)

The Bindman and Johnson studies are consistent in that Negro students were shown to be distinctly unprepared to function adequately at the university. In fact, Johnson's data permit the observation that the white students were only slightly better prepared. White students from white high schools averaged a little less than a "middle-C" while the Negro students from such schools earned a "D" average.

Johnson also found that the Negroes and whites who earned the highest grade-point averages had graduated from a single integrated high school. This finding was not inconsistent with his main findings. An unspecified number of Negro and white high-scorers, however, were found to come from a single predominantly Negro school. From this finding, Johnson and his associates leapt to the conclusion that "predominantly Negro schools seem to be able to provide a quality education."[1]

---

[1] Norman J. Johnson, Robert Wyer, and Neil Gilbert, "Quality Education and Integration: An Exploratory Study," Phylon, Fall, 1967, pp. 223-224.

Such a conclusion seems unwarranted, for several reasons. This exceptional Negro school is listed as being attended by middle-class students; the relative success, if it can be documented, thus reflects a class rather than a racial difference. Also, exceedingly few students are involved in these calculations; these are most highly selected students from a great mass of poorly-educated children. The fact that a handful succeeds is not exceptional; and it has no beneficial impact on those who fail. Following is a compilation, not presented by Johnson:[2]

Predicted and Actual Grades at the University of Illinois of Graduates of 12 Chicago High Schools, by Race
September, 1963-February, 1965

Origin of Students	Predicted grade-pt. average	Actual grade-pt. average	Percentile ranking in high school graduating class	Number of Students	Percent Negro
Six top-ranked high schools	3.44	3.33	69	753	1
Six lowest-ranked high schools	2.10	2.45	90	99	96

---

1. Ibid., p. 228.
2. Integrated Education, August-September, 1966, p.10.

The racial differential in scholastic performance is overwhelming.

During 1959-1960, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights sponsored two conferences on desegregation.[1] Superintendents attended from school systems in eighteen states and the District of Columbia. Eleven of them spoke to the question of whether desegregation had lowered academic standards in their systems. Nine said no, and two yes. All noted the initial lag of Negro students but most observed that special measures had invariably led to improvement. In 1958, seventy school systems in various stages of desegregation were studied.[2] Two thirds of the schools were re-studied in 1963.[3] Wey reports: "In 1958 many teachers and principals felt that desegregation had neccessitated a lowering of some academic standards.... In 1963 only two out of forty responsible felt that the instructional program had been handicapped by the placement of Negroes in formerly all-white schools. Administrators and teachers stated over and over that they had a better institutional program now than they had before desegregation began.[4]

In Washington, D.C., after five years of desegregation, Negro students "performed somewhat better" than during the five years preceding desegregation; at the same time, white students performed "at least as well" as under segregation.[1] Morland compared the reading and arithmetic median scores of two ninth grade classes in Austin, Texas.[2] Following desegregation, these scores remained essentially unchanged. A study of Evansville, Indiana, concluded that the academic level of the school had not been "noticeably lowered" by desegregation.[3]

---

[1] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Conference on Education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959) and Second Annual Conference on Problems of Schools in Transition from the Educator's Viewpoint, Gatlinburg, Tennessee (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960).

[2] Herbert W. Wey and John Corey, Action Patterns in School Desegregation. A Guidebook (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1959).

[3] Herbert W. Wey, "Desegregation--It Works," Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1964.

[4] Ibid.

Between 1957 and 1962, a minimal junior college program to deal mainly with academic shortcomings of Negro students succeeded in increasing the percentage who graduated from two to seven.[4] In 1963, a sample of Chicago sixth grade students took the "Word Knowledge" section of the Metropolitan Achievement Test. Following is a table of the median stanine of sixth grade achievement test scores by race and socioeconomic status of the school:[5]

Race, Class and Achievement
In Chicago Schools, 1963

Neighborhood	White School	Integrated School	Negro School
High education status	6.0	5.0	5.0
Median education status	5.5	4.5	4.0
Low education status	5.0	4.0	3.0

---

1. Carl F. Hansen, "The Scholastic Performance of Negro and White Pupils in the Integrated Public Schools of the District of Columbia," Harvard Educational Review, (Summer, 1960).

2. J. Kenneth Morland, Token Desegregation and Beyond (New York: Anti-Defamation League, 1963).

3. Alfred D. Wiley, A study of Desegregation in the Evansville School Corporation, Evansville, Indiana, (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1961), Summary in Dissertation Abstracts, XXII (1962), 3477.

4. Charles Monroe, "A 'Basic Program' in Junior College," Integrated Education, (January, 1963).

5. Philip M. Hauser, Chairman, Report to the Board of Education, City of Chicago, by the Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools (Chicago: Board of Education, March 31, 1964), p. 86.

The New York City Demonstration Guidance Project exemplifies a project which was interracial but in which ethnicity was not the focal point of attention.[1] Selected students in a predominantly Puerto Rican-Negro junior high school were given extensive services and various special aids. Over a period of 38 months, the median I.Q. score for 105 students rose 9.3 points on the Pintner Test of General Ability. Compared with preproject youngsters, nearly four times as many of those who went on to finish high school--itself a large number--also entered college. The project, it should be noted, involved the movement of children from an ethnically segregated elementary school to an integrated high school.[2]

III. Controlled Studies of the Effects of Desegregation

Two studies have been made of desegregation in Oakland, California, by Elliott and Badal and by the Dumbarton Research Council.[3]

Elliott and Badal tried to answer this question: "Does racial composition of the school make a difference in achievement when scholastic aptitude is controlled?" Their subjects were 4,693 fifth graders in October, 1962.

---

[1] See Henry T. Hillson and Florence C. Myers, The Demonstration Guidance Project, 1957-1962. Pilot Program for Higher Horizons (New York: Board of Education, 1963) and New York City Board of Education, Demonstration Guidance Project, Fourth Annual Progress Report, (1959-1960) (New York: Board of Education, 1961).

[2] Morris I. Berkowitz, Studies of School Desegregation and Achievement. A Summary (Pittsburgh, Pa.: Commission on Human Relations, May, 1967), pp. 5-6.

[3] Merle H. Elliott and Alden W. Badal, "Achievement and Racial Composition of Schools," California Journal of Educational Research, September, 1965; Dumbarton Research Council, Race and Education in the City of Oakland, Draft. (An unpublished study prepared for the U.S Commission on Civil Rights. Menlo Park, California, October, 1966).

Schools were classified by percent Negro: 80 percent and over, 46 to 79 percent, 11 to 45 percent, and 10 percent and less. Every child took an aptitude test (SCAT) and three achievement tests (STEP). Mathematics achievement scores rose as the percent Negro enrolled fell. Writing achievement scores also rose for the two-out of six--highest ability levels of children; for the lower ability levels, no significant differences were found. Reading achievement scores seemed altogether unaffected by racial composition of school. All in all, concluded Elliott and Badal, racial composition makes no important difference for achievement when scholastic aptitude is controlled. Thus, by implication, the importance of racial desegregation was denied.

As the researchers themselves note, their study does not concern changes brought about in individual children as much as in school atmosphere. Without relating school atmosphere to classroom behavior of specific children, it is difficult to see what value resides in such a study. It is as difficult to explain the main findings as the exceptions. Specifically lacking is a basis for assessing the impact of racially mixed schools upon the learning of specific children. In this real sense, the Elliott and Badal study is not a test of desegregation.

The Dumbarton study undertook to discover "whether significant differences would be observed between those Negroes whose elementary school experience had been in segregated or predominantly Negro schools and those whose experience had been in racially balanced schools; and, similarly, between white children who had attended only all-white elementary schools, or only racially balanced schools."[1] Some forty percent of Oakland's public high school graduates had attended the city schools continously since entering first grade in 1953. After omission of a number of these (Orientals, Spanish-surnamed, and others), a sample of 400 remained. A great number were interviewed.

Summary achievement results are stated by the

---

[1] Race and Education in the City of Oakland, pp. 114-115.

Dumbarton researchers: "White children perform better than Negro; Negroes in racially mixed schools better than Negroes in segregated schools."[1] A social gulf exists between Negro and white children. Can the greater academic achievement of Negroes in mixed schools be attributed to social class differences? The researchers point out that all Negro children in the study were highly comparable with regard to parents' incomes, occupations, and educational achievement levels. These, of course, are the variables customarily equated with socioeconomic background. It would appear, then, that achievement differences between the two groups of Negro children are to be attributed to the beneficial effect of interracial schooling. But the Dumbarton researchers fail to make such a claim.

Instead, they point to a series of narrower social factors which, en toto, might well account for the achievement differences among the Negro students. Family factors predominate. Families of Negro children attending racially mixed schools show the following differences from children attending Negro schools:[2]

> ... Smaller families and greater family stability--a significantly higher proportion...lived during their childhood with both natural parents; home ownership; a visiting pattern which must mean more friendships between parents and children of both races. The mother of the child in the desegregated school was much more likely to be working and less likely to be on welfare, and therefore less alienated from and hostile toward the white world.

White children, on the other hand, were found to achieve more in white-segregated than in mixed schools. This difference, however, was clearly a result of social class rather than color. Whites in all-white schools were of a much higher social status than whites in mixed schools.

---

[1] Ibid., fn. 1, p. 123.
[2] Ibid.

Unfortunately, the Dumbarton study is available only in draft form. A full statistical analysis of test scores is still to be made. Unlike the Elliott-Badal study, the present research is truly longitudinal. It finds academic achievement to be benefited by desegregation. But it tends to resolve the desegregation effect into various social class constituents. No effort is made to separate out the precise relative contributions of racial desegregation and socioeconomic status to achievement. Also, neither study attempts to discover whether the race-achievement tie is more salient for classrooms than for schools. It follows, too, that neither study undertook an analysis of ability grouping to find whether the location of children reflects deliberate administrative decisions in inherent relationships of achievement and ethnicity

Stallings studies academic achievement both before and after desegregation in Louisville. After one year, Negro achievement scores rose more than those of whites.[1] Stallings, it should be observed, did not contrast differential achievement in segregated and desegregated schools. Instead, he grouped all students of each race and compared the two races. This procedure obscures the precise connections between desegregation and improved achievement.[2] Katz observed that improved academic achievement occurred in segregated as well as desegregated schools. Accordingly, such improved learning should be "attributed to factors other than desegregation, such as a general improvement in educational standards."[1] Nevertheless, Pettigrew points to the constructive motivational effects of desegregation in raising the sights of Negro children even when their schools continue to be segregated.[2]

---

[1] See Frank H. Stallings, "A Study of the Imme-Effects of Integration on Scholastic Achievement in the Louisville Public Schools," Journal of Negro Education, (Winter, 1959); and Stallings' statement in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Second Annual Conference on Problems of Schools in Transition from the Educator's Viewpoint (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960), p. 148

[2] Meyer Weinberg, Research on School Desegregation: Review and Prospect (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1965), p.4.

Between 1958 and 1967, fourteen studies of learning under desegregation were made. Most deal with an experiment in a single school system, and they must be adjudged more or less rigorously. Following is a discussion of these studies.

Samuels conducted a study in New Albany, Indiana, which sought to discover whether school learning proceeded at comparable rates for Negro and white children when children were first desegregated in junior high school and when Negro students in desegregated schools were compared with those in segregated schools.[3] In both cases, Samuels attempted to control variables such as socioeconomic status and intelligence. For nearly all the students involved, the junior high years were their first experience with desegregation.

In the first comparison, Negro and whites students were matched, and their academic achievement over two years compared with the use of achievement test results and classroom grades. In the second comparison, two groups of Negro students were the subjects: one consisted of children who had attended mixed elementary schools; the other, children who had attended a segregated school. All comparisons involved matched groups.

---

[1] Irwin Katz, "Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes," American Psychologist, (June, 1964), p. 384.

[2] Thomas F. Pettigrew, A Profile of the Negro American (Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1964), p. 128.

[3] See Ivan G. Samuels, Desegregated Education and Differences in Academic Achievement, (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1958) (University Microfilms Order No. 58-2934).

Samuels found that after two years of desegregation, the achievement gap between Negro and white had narrowed significantly. The researcher attributed this improvement directly to desegregation. He found, too, that the Negro children who attended interracial elementary schools started out in first grade achieving at the same level as Negro children did in the segregated school. By third grade, however, the desegregated Negro children had pulled ahead; this continued into sixth grade. Overall, Samuels observed that "the longer the association between any particular group of white and Negro students the smaller the differences in academic achievement appear to be... and that the Negro students who had been educated in mixed schools achieved as well as and sometimes better than white students in the integrated program."[1]

Fortenberry studied Negro achievement in Oklahoma City under conditions of segregation and desegregation.[2] Achievement scores of a sample of eighth and ninth grade Negro students were compared with their sixth grade scores. Some of the children had never attended a desegregated school, and others had attended segregated schools through the sixth grade but a desegregated school in the seventh and eighth grades. All subjects had had statistically similar achievement test scores in sixth grade.

Findings showed that by eighth grade, students in mixed classes had gained more in arithmetic while neither group had gained more in reading. By ninth grade, children in mixed classes scored higher in arithmetic and language while the children in non-mixed classes scored higher in reading. All differences were statistically significant. Fortenberry's overall conclusion was that "in general, Negroes achieve better in mixed than in non-mixed classes."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 100

[2] See James H. Fortenberry, The Achievement of Negro Pupils in Mixed and non-Mixed Schools, (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1959), (University Microfilms Order No. 59-5492).

Spruill's study did not deal directly with our topic, but a side remark of his is of some interest. His study involved twenty-nine teachers in Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, and West Virginia. After desegregation, he noted, it often became clear that "white students entering predominantly Negro schools are slower learners than the average white child which may eventually cause Negro parents to lose respect for thier school because they will say it is a dumping group for slow learners...."[2] If this is generally true, it would seem necessary to guard doubly against the pitfalls of comparing newly desegregated Negro children with white children of a lower socioeconomic position. The specific pitfall is to attend too much to the racial component of desegregation without observing simultaneous changes in the social class situation.

Katzenmeyer studied the effect of social interaction on achievement of Negro and white pupils in the public schools of Jackson, Michigan.[3] He hypothesized that "the measured intelligence of the group of Negro children will be significantly changed as the consequence of school experience which enhances their opportunities for social interaction with the dominant white culture."[4]

All children entering kindergarten in October and November, 1957 and 1958 were given a standard intelligence test. Included were 193 Negroes and 1,061 whites. All were retested in second grade during October, 1959 and 1960. Treating the Negroes as an experimental group and the whites as a control, the mean I.Q. scores were as follows:[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 44

[2] Albert W. Spruill, Consequences Encountered by Negro Teachers in the Process of Desegregation of Schools in Four Southern States (Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1958, p. 133) (University Microfilms Order No. 59-1518).

[3] See William G. Katzenmeyer, Social Interaction and Differences in Intelligence Test Performance of Negro and White Elementary School Pupils (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1962) (University Microfilms Order No. 63-2227).

[4] Ibid., p. 9

	1957-1958	1959-1960
Experimental group	83.06	89.74
Control group	102.04	103.91

The change in means of the experimental group was found to be statistically significant beyond the .001 level. Katzenmeyer concluded that the change was to be explained principally by the social interaction between Negro and white children. In Jackson, he noted, "the great majority of the Negro population is confined to a small area of the city by economic limitations and by discriminatory policies and pressures in the sale of real estate.... Thus, for most Negro children, entry into the racially mixed public school program represents the beginning of a period of increased social contact."[2] Another part of the explanation, according to Katzenmeyer, is the high per student expenditure in Jackson schools. Presumably, the Negro child, more deprived to begin with, benefited more from the challenge of a more adequate educational program.

As a matter of fact, Katzenmeyer claimed less for his study than his data permit. An examination of his statistical findings reveals that 184 of the total Negro sample of 193 were enrolled in six of the city's sixteen elementary schools. In these six schools, Negro children constituted 34.1 percent of total enrollment. The remaining nine Negro students of the sample attended five other schools. Five more schools were all-white. Rearranging and recalculating data

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 57-58.

[2] Ibid., p. 64.

2

on changes in mean test scores, we get the following:[1]

Gain in Points on Mean Test Scores

6 schools with 184 Negro children	6.54	0.50
5 schools with 9 Negro children	8.93	1.14
5 schools with no Negro children	----	2.76

For all practical purposes, the bottom ten schools can be dropped. If so, then the difference in test means between experimental (Negro) and control (White) is larger than Katzenmeyer reported. Instead of 6.68 vs. 1.87, it becomes 6.54 vs. 0.50. No socioeconomic data are available, but initial mean I.Q. scores for the three control sub-groups were, in the above order, 98.81, 102.84, and 102.57; for the two experimental sub-groups, they were 82.77 and 88.53.[2]

Katzenmeyer concluded: "While the implications of this study point to some of the disadvantages of segregated schools, they suggest that the answer to the equalization of educational opportunities lies only partially in 'integration' per se; they suggest that a problem basic to the school lies in guiding and encouraging the assimilative process."[3]
Two observations remain to be noted about Katzenmeyer's procedure. First, the experimental group might have been matched with a control group of Negro children. And it would have been instructive to know the color composition of each classroom within the six schools. In this way, the significance of social interaction could have been tested more directly.

Lesser and his associates conducted a study in New York City of academic achievement under varying conditions of racial balance and imbalance; minority children in the study included Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Chinese, and Jews.[1] Some 400 children were tested for verbal ability, reasoning, numerical ability, and space conceptualization. "For every one of the four abilities measured," according to Lesser, "the children from the more integrated schools and neighborhoods showed significantly superior performance when compared to the children from racially-imbalanced schools and neighborhoods."[2] A "convergence-effect" was observed: "In the more racially-balanced schools, the children from the various ethnic groups show quite similar scores--displaying levels of ability more similar to each other. In contrast, in the racially imbalanced schools, average test scores for each ethnic group remain markedly different.[3] Lesser held that factors other than racial composition--social class, for example--helped explain the results but that the racial factor was basic. Unfortunately, no supporting data were presented in the article and so it is not possible to assess this research.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 56-59.
[2] See table in ibid., p. 57.
[3] Ibid., p. 67.

Gunthorpe studied Negro-white academic differentials in Copiague, Long Island.[4] The town's three elementary and one junior high school are almost perfectly balanced racially. Negroes make up about twenty-one percent of the population of the school district; another forty percent is of Italian descent. In the junior high school, students are assigned to one of three tracks, with track A being the highest one. Here is the racial composition of the tracks, by percentage:[5]

---

[1] Gerald S. Lesser, Kristine M. Rosenthal, Sally E. Polkoff, and Marjorie B. Pfankuch, "Some effects of Segregation and Desegregation in the Schools," Integrated Education, (June-July, 1964)

[2] Ibid., p. 21.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Muriel B. Gunthorpe, A comparison of Negro and White Student Participation in Selected Classes of a Junior High School Program (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1964) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-8477).

[5] Ibid., p. 83.

	Track A	Track B	Track C
Negroes	10.0	22.6	33.3
Whites	90.0	77.4	66.6

Curiously, however, no significant difference was found between achievement test scores for Negro and white students in seventh and eighth grades.[1] On the other hand, white students were significantly higher (at the five percent level) than Negro students in social status and scholastic ability. The differences, however, are not of overwhelming magnitude. Copiague does not have sharply different social levels among its people.

Negro students do not have poor attendance records and they do participate in school programs. Yet, the school newspaper staff consists entirely of white students, all of whom are in the highest track. Although Negro junior high school students do not account for a disproportionately high number of academic failures, neither do they earn a proportionate number of academic honors. Negroes, Gunthorpe concluded, were simply not being placed in a track according to their actual achievement. The principal factor in enforcing this discriminatory structure was the faculty: "Data tended to indicate that teacher standards for honors were geared toward the A track placement.... A number of Negro students could compete at the level of higher curriculum tracks."[2]

Wolman investigated the educational changes brought on by a transfer of Negro students in New Rochelle, New York.[3] Half the enrollment in a virtually all-Negro elementary school was transferred to various predominantly white schools. After one year, achievement tests were taken by all transferees. Changes in achievement registered by transferees in grades one through five were found to be statistically insignificant. Further analysis was directed at possible social class factors in the situation. Means of the reading scores of Negro transferees and nontransferees were compared with those of the white children in the receiving school; the latter were significantly higher. The whites were socio-economically comparable with the Negro children; in other words, both were fairly low-income.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 97.

[2] Ibid., p. 163.

[3] T. G. Wolman, "Learning Effects of Integration in New Rochelle," Integrated Education, (December, 1964-January, 1965).

Wolman then analyzed a year's achievement changes among the kindergarten children. Here she found a statistically significant change. Gains of this group exceeded those of the Negro non-transferees and the white receivers. Wolman interpreted the kindergarten experience as another evidence of the importance of early intervention. "We can assume," she wrote, "that exposure to favorable learning circumstances at an early enough age can have a salutary and compensatory effect on the education potential of minority and otherwise deprived children."[1] Unfortunately, no statistical data were presented in the article so that it is not possible to assess fully the research by Wolman.

Matzen studied the effect of racial composition upon achievement in the San Francisco Bay Area.[2] He stated his problem as "What is the relationship between the proportion of Negro children in a classroom and the mean scholastic achievement of Negro and non-Negro students?"[3] Eleven hundred students in eleven schools were tested; only Negroes and Caucasians were included. The tests were administered to fifth and seventh grade students from October 15 to November 1, 1963. Findings were reported in terms of four major relationships: (1) percent of Negroes and achievement; (2) percent of Negroes and mean intellectual ability; (3) mean intellectual ability and achievement; and (4) socioeconomic status and achievement.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 31.

[2] Stanley P. Matzen, The Relationship Between Racial Composition and Scholastic Achievement in Elementary School Classrooms (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-2518.

[3] Ibid., p.1.

1. In general, there was a tendency for achievement to vary inversely with PN (percent Negro), with, however, some "notable exceptions." Of twenty-one fifth-grade classrooms, data for five showed exceptional trends. For example thirty-one students in classroom number twenty were below average in socioeconomic status, above average in achievement and I.Q. and had fewer Negroes than the average (5.9 percent vs. 51.7 percent). Classroom number six was considerably above average in I.Q. score, below average in achievement, and very high in percent Negro.

Matzen suggests that much of the negative relationship between PN and achievement may be attributable to common practices of classroom grouping. For example, relatively few high-achieving Negroes will be placed in classrooms with high-achieving whites. Remaining in the classroom are mostly lower-achieving Negroes, thus the result is a more negative relationship between race and achievement.

2. I.Q., like achievement, tends to vary inversely with PN. Matzen stresses, however, the presence of "numerous exceptions" and characterizes the relationship between the two variables as "far from perfect."[1]

3. Achievement varies directly with socioeconomic position. While the entire student sample was heavily lower class, over half the fifth graders achieved above grade level. Only one third of the seventh graders were above grade level.

4. Matzen then tried to discover how achievement and PN were related when he held I.Q. and socioeconomic status constant. Achievement tended to fall as PN rose, but the tendency was not strong enough to reach statistical significance. Matzen acknowledged that white parents might nevertheless interpret the situation as demonstrating conclusively the negative influence of Negroes on white achievement. Because, however, achievement scores of Negro children also tend to decline as PN increases, Matzen wrote: "It appears that Negro parents may have stronger grounds

---

[1] Ibid., p. 42.

than non-Negro parents for objecting to attendance boundaries which assign their children to predominantly Negro schools."[1]

And yet, PN and achievement were differently related in fifth grade than in seventh grade. One possible reason offered by Matzen is a difference in classroom grouping practices. In the fifth grade, students were much less homogeneously grouped than in seventh grade; therefore, Negro-white differentials were greater in grade five. In grade seven, on the other hand, grouping was quite homogeneous with bright Negro children being placed in classrooms with bright white children. Negro-white differences were thus minimized. In other words, in fifth grade you were as likely to find equal numbers of Negroes and whites in the low-scoring as in the high-scoring classrooms. In the seventh grade, high-scoring whites tended to be in one classroom, and low-scoring Negroes in another one. In the latter case, the negative relation between PN achievement was high; in the former case, it was low.

Clearly, it is quite possible to interpret Matzen's findings as indicating that the presence of Negroes must be minimized if achievement is to be maximized. Matzen prefers an alternative explanation, one that he calls "equally plausible," This is his suggestion that a new variable E Q (educational quality) be constructed. Making up this variable would be indices of teacher competence and motivation, quality of textbooks and other instructional materials, enrichment-value of the classroom and school environment, and similar determiners, on the school's side, of how much pupils learn."[2] Matzen hypothesizes that E Q would be found to be negatively correlated with PN, and positively related to I.Q.: achievement, and socioeconomic position. In short, with schools of equal quality, the percent of Negroes in a classroom could no longer have a negative effect on achievement. But, adds Matzen, the racial composition of the classrooms "would still be a matter of great moment to parents and educators as a determiner of the social and emotional aspects of student development."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 100.

[2] Ibid., p. 114.

Anderson studied the effect of desegregation on Negro children in Nashville.[2] Seventy-five Negro fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students in five desegregated schools were compared with a like number from three all-Negro schools. The former, who constituted from eight to thirty-three percent of enrollment in their schools, had attended desegregated schools up to six years. All children in the sample were from the same neighborhoods. Testing took place in May, 1963.

Academic achievement was significantly higher in the desegregated than in the segregated schools. Children who entered a desegregated school near the beginning of their school career achieved significantly better than segregated pupils. On the other hand, children who were desegregated only in fifth or sixth grade achieved less than did Negro children in the segregated schools. The significance of academic achievement in this research is impossible to gauge, inasmuch as no controls for social class were evident.

Radin compared Negro children in two Ypsilanti, Michigan, schools with respect to achievement and I.Q. scores.[3] An all-Negro school and a school whose enrollment is forty-five percent Negro were used. Students were of like socioeconomic status, and there were no significant I.Q. score differences between the groups of students. A standard achievement test was administered at the beginning and the close of the 1964-1965 school year. Although all changes favored children in the integrated school, none of the changes was statistically significant.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 115.

[2] Louis V. Anderson, The Effects of Desegregation on the Achievement and Personality Patterns of Negro Children (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-11,237).

[3] Norma Radin, A Comparison of the Test Performance of Negro Students Attending All-Negro and Integrated Elementary Schools in One Community, Ypsilanti, Michigan Public Schools, April 15, 1966, unpublished.

There is some question about the integrated character of one school. Radin herself noted that "a 45 percent Negro enrollment does not represent genuine balance in the schools inasmuch as 21 percent of the entire population is non-white."[1] An independent check discovered that as of February 15, 1966, Ypsilanti's eleven elementary schools enrolled 21.9 percent Negro; 944 out of 4.312 were Negro.[2] The 45 percent school would be classified as imbalanced or segregated under at least two measures: those of Robert A. Dentler and the California State Department of Education.[3] It would be difficult for such a school to escape the label of "Negro school" given its predominantly Negro faculty and its exceptional racial composition in a city of only 25,000 people.

Lockwood studied certain factors in school achievement.[4] She compared Negro achievement in racially balanced (2) and imbalanced (5) schools in an upstate New York city over a two-year period. On a global comparison, no significant achievement differences were found between children in either type of school. However, when students were divided into groups who had attended balanced or unbalanced schools for two years or longer, a significant difference emerged in favor of the children[1] in the racially balanced schools.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 3.

[2] Telephone discussion with Miss Delores Tripp, School Specialist, Michigan Civil Rights Commission, December 7, 1967.

[3] See Robert A. Dentler, "A Basis for Classifying Ethnic Composition of Schools," Memorandum No. 5 of the Education Complex Study (New York: Center for Urban Education); and California State Department of Education, Racial and Ethnic Survey of California Public Schools, Part One: Distribution of Pupils, Fall, 1966 (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, March, 1967.

[4] Jane D. Lockwood, An Examination of Scholastic Achievement, Attitudes and Home Background Factors of Sixth-Grade Negro Students in Balanced and Unbalanced Schools, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-8303).

During 1966, a series of studies of desegregation were made under the direction of Stout and Inger.[2] Their main interest was in the dynamics of community adoption of school desegregation. In the process of gathering data, the investigators recorded impressionistic generalizations about the learning effects of desegregation in the eight communities. In no sense was a formal evaluation done. It should be noted that desegregation was not introduced at the same time in each city.

Here are some extracts from the reports:[3]

> ... We saw virtually no evidence of change in achievement levels among Negro children who participated in the various plans .... We concluded that no consistent change in achievement levels of participating Negro children is apparent, but that it is perhaps too soon to expect such change.... In four cities the achievement levels of Caucasian children whose schools act as receiving schools are not affected by the desegregation process. We found evidence of no change in the achievement levels of these children .... Some attempts were also made to alter the school program to account

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 49-50.

[2] Robert Stout and Morton Inger, School Desegregation: Progress in Eight Cities (unpublished study prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1966). See Chapter 12, "The Effects of Desegregation." The cities surveyed were Berkeley, White Plains, Teaneck, N.Y., Greenburgh District No. 8, N.Y., Pottsville, Pa., Englewood, N.J., Syracuse, N.Y. and Rochester, N.Y.

[3] Ibid., chapter 12, pp. 6, 8, 9, and 16.

> for the new circumstances.... It is too early to evaluate them....

These tentative observations might prove of benchmark value to later researchers.

Beker and associates studied various aspects of desegregation in Syracuse, New York.[1] Through a series of administrative factors entirely beyond the power of the researchers to control, it proved impractical to reach many definite conclusions. Several aspects of the study, however, remain noteworthy. One member of the research team, Hopi, investigated the effect of residential status on student "assimilation." He studied the social adjustment of 656 students who entered four schools for the first time. Some had been transferred for reasons of desegregation; others, because their families had moved into the area. When both types of students were asked to gauge the effect of race and socioeconomic status on their social adjustment, most replied that these factors had not affected them. Teachers, on the other hand, disagreed. Hopi concluded that the students were nearer the truth.

Beker, after cautioning about the limited number of cases involved, concluded:

> ... The data... offer little to support the claims of those who express the fear that disadvantaged Negro elementary school children will be "hurt" more if they are forced to compete with high-achieving, middle-class whites than they might be by attending more homogeneous, inner city schools. On the other hand, the results tend to confirm that there are marked differences in performance as well as social cleavages between the groups, and it seems apparent that desegregation did little to close such gaps in the course of

---

[1] Jerome Beker, A Study of Integration in Racially Imbalanced Urban Public Schools. A Demonstration and Evaluation. Final Report (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Youth Development Center, May, 1967).

the first year.[1]

Beker's study does not lend itself to a systematic evaluation.

Walker, Stinchcombe, and McDill studied certain aspects of desegregation in Baltimore.[2] In a penetrating analysis of the career of school segregation, they make many valuable comments on segregation as well as on the local situation. For present purposes, however, the most significant aspect of the Walker study is its innovative demonstration of the mathematics of educational disadvantage. Table I (page   embodied the demonstration.[3]

The table estimates the total educational disadvantage of a Baltimore Negro student in twelfth grade as almost three years (2.91 grades); verbal ability is the criterion of disadvantage. Here is a summary description of each line in the table, assuming the case of a Negro student attending a seventy-percent Negro public school:

1. Considerably more than half the total disadvantage (1.83 grades) results from past deprivation.
2. Even if all Negro students were distributed equally among all the Baltimore public schools, a residual disadvantage in verbal ability would remain.
3. Lines one and two account for more than two thirds of the total disadvantage. These factors are not the result of current conditions in Baltimore although they may be perpetuated by them.
4. Part of the disadvantage arise from the fact that very few Negroes reside in Baltimore County, outside Baltimore City. The resulting segregation adds another element of disadvantage.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 354.

[2] Dollie Walker, Arthur S. Stinchcombe, and Mary S. McDill, School Desegregation in Baltimore (Baltimore, Maryland: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, John Hopkins University, August, 1967).

[3] Ibid., p.27.

5. Three quarters of the total disadvantage, i. e., 2.28 grades out of 2.91 grades, is attributable to past policies and their continuation outside Baltimore City itself.
6. An additional disadvantage is present because of the over-representation of Negroes in Baltimore City.
7. Another disadvantage arises from the concentration of Negroes in Baltimore public schools as the private schools in Baltimore City are predominantly white.
8. Assuming our example is a Negro attending a school seventy percent Negro while the system as a whole is sixty-one percent Negro, he suffers an additional educational disadvantage by attending this particular school.

Walker and colleagues also note that certain disadvantaging effects of family background are not included in the table.

Implicit in this table is a specific approach to segregation and desegregation. Educational disadvantagement is interpreted as being closely connected with racial segregation and is presented as an historical product as well as a contemporary phenomenon. Desegregation, then, becomes a means of reducing educational disadvantagement. The table also points up the relationship between segregation in the inner city and the concentration of whites in outlying areas. The influence of socioeconomic factors is minimized or regarded as negligible. This in itself is a particular viewpoint which is contrary to prevailing interpretations. So global is the prevailing view, however, that a quantification of it seems out of the question. If, that is, family background "explains all," then such a declaration constitutes its own quantification on the other hand, an effort to draw distinctions among factors--as Walker and associates do--seems more likely to be helpful. We may add more factors, evaluate them differently, assign alternative values, and omit some altogether. All in all, there is more to work with in Walker's approach.

TABLE I.

Estimated Components of Average Educational Disadvantages:

Baltimore City Negro Students

Component	Estimated Disadvantage in Standard Deviation of Verbal Ability	Approximate Equivalent at 12th Grade
(1) Historical and sociological disadvantages of the average Negro in an all-white school	.61	1.83
(2) Additional disadvantage if Negroes nationally distributed exactly equally in all schools	.07	.21
(3) Total unrelated to current segregation, (1) + (2)	.68	2.04
(4) Due to segregation in Baltimore Metropolitan Area	.08	.24
(5) Total not influenced by local segregation, (3) + (4)	.76	2.28
(6) Due to segregation in Central City of Baltimore	.08	.24
(7) Due to private school segregation and predominance of Negroes in public schools	.11	.33
(8) Due to segregation within Baltimore City public schools	.02	.06
(9) Total estimated disadvantage*	.97	2.91

*This estimate eliminates certain effects of family background.

The table is not only valuable for analytical purposes but also as a basis for remedial action. For example, almost one third the total disadvantage could be remedied by the creation of a metropolitan school district, including the City and County of Baltimore (lines 4, 6, 7, and 8) in which private schools would be required to desegregate. The table also underscores the great challenge of overcoming the historical deficit.

In 1967, McPartland studied the effect of school and classroom desegregation on academic achievement.[1] He used verbal achievement test scores derived from 5,075 Negro ninth-graders in New England and Middle Atlantic states. The principal findings are reported in Table 2.

It will be noted that McPartland's work was directly relevant to several research questions that had arisen in earlier investigation.

1. Do racial effects in achievement persist even when social class factors are taken into account?
2. Is there a different racial effect on achievement in desegregated schools as contrasted with desegregated classrooms?
3. Are racial effects on achievement simply artifacts of ability grouping procedures?

Let us examine his findings.

Five generalizations can be made. One, racial classroom desegregation has a positive effect on achievement, and this influence is for the most part independent of family background; compare lines 1 and 2. Two, "... regardless of the racial composition of the school, the average achievement of Negro students increases with the proportion of their classmates who are white;"[2] compare lines 2 and 3. Three, the whiter" the school, the more beneficial is classroom desegregation to the Negro child; compare lines 3a - 3d. Four, "... when classroom racial composition as well as family background differences are held constant, there is no evidence that the percent white enrolled in the school has any appreciable influence on Negro student achievement;"[1] compare lines 5 and 6. Five, "... Negro students who remain in segregated classes receive no benefit in terms of their academic growth from attendance at desegregated schools.... Segregated classes may be more detrimental for Negro student achievement if they occur in mostly white schools rather than mostly Negro schools;"[2] compare lines 6a-b and 6c-d.

---

[1] James McPartland, The Relative Influence of School Desegregation and of Classroom Desegregation on the Academic Achievement of Ninth Grade Negro Students. Interim Report (Baltimore, Maryland: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, September, 1967).

[2] Ibid., p. 3.

Matzen, it will be recalled, concluded that ability grouping accounted for a good deal of what appeared to be racial differentials in achievement. While McPartland, too, found school selection processes play a role, it was a distinctly minor one. He concluded, therefore, that the desegregative effect in classrooms could not be explained by the schools' selection processes, and that race was an autonomous factor.

McPartland's study utilized raw data that were gathered originally for the Coleman Report (see below, Chapter 7). It also reflects the re-analysis of these data that was done for the Racial Isolation study of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (see below, Chapter 7).

McPartland has noted that his study was cross-sectional, not longitudinal. Thus, strictly speaking, he did not trace the effects of desegregation. The varying percentages of Negro and white students could have existed since the building of each school in the study. At best, then, McPartland's data suggest relationships in interracial classrooms, irrespective of whether the classroom had ever been anything but interracial. Many studies in the area of race and education have this characteristic.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 4.

[2] Ibid.

TABLE 2

Weighted Parameters of Main Effects on Ninth Grade Negro Student Verbal Achievement, Under Different Control Conditions[1]

Effect Variable	Effect Parameter	
1. Proportions white classmates (3 comparisons)	+.16	
2. Proportion white classmates, controlling family background (18)	+.13	
3. Proportion white classmates, controlling family background and percent white in school (72)	+.13	
(a) 0 - 19 percent white in school (18)		+.07
(b) 20 -49 percent white in school (18)		+.16
(c) 50 -69 percent white in school (18)		+.19
(d) 70 -99 percent white in school (18)		+.34
4. Percent white in school (3)	+.13	
5. Percent white in school, controlling family background (18)	+.11	
6. Percent white in school, controlling family background and proportion white classmates (72)	+.02	
(a) No white classmates (18)		-.03
(b) Less than half white classmates (18)		-.02
(c) About half white classmates (18)		+.03
(d) More than half white classmates (18)		+.09

---

[1] The numbers in parentheses are the number of comparisons which were combined in the weighted average of achievement increments. Each value in this table is based on 5,075 cases.

Evaluated in its own right, the McPartland research is outstanding for its rigor as well as its sensitivity to the central research concerns of the field. All in all, it sets a very high standard, not least for its brevity: it is only 16 pages long.

Graves and Bedell reported on an evaluation of achievement in the White Plains desegregation experience.[1] In 1964, the school board had established a desegregation plan whereby each of the city's ten elementary schools was to enroll from 10 to 30 percent Negro. A predominantly Negro school was closed down and five segregated white schools were balanced. The Graves-Bedell evaluation made three comparisons: (a) between two groups of white students before and after desegregation; (b) between two groups of inner city students both before and after desegregation, and (c) another more restricted comparison of the latter type. Stanford Achievement Tests were used.

Comparison A. One hundred fifty white students were compared with one hundred twenty-nine other white students. The latter attended the same schools that the former had attended, only now they were desegregated. What was the impact of desegregation on academic achievement? None, apparently. In tests on paragraph meaning and word meaning, the 129 had made higher scores; in tests on arithmetic reasoning and computation, the 150 were higher. Judged by changes in median test scores, desegregation in White Plains had not interfered with the generally high level of academic achievement by white students.

Comparison B. The scores of thirty-six children who had been enrolled in now-closed segregated Rochambeau School and thirty-three children who lived in the same area but now attended racially balanced schools were compared. In paragraph meaning and arithmetic reasoning, the children in the racially balanced schools had gained more. In arithmetic computation, the segregated children gained more. In word meaning, there were similar outcomes. It also was reported that during two years a larger percentage of children in racially balanced schools than in segregated ones had made as much as one and one-half years' academic progress in all four achievement test areas (85 percent vs. 67 percent). It is possible, then, that desegregation benefited these children, even if only slightly.

---

[1] Marian F. Graves and Frederick D. Bedell, A Three Year Evaluation of the White Plains Racial Balance Plan (White Plains, New York: Board of Education, October 16, 1967)

Comparison C. Two groups of inner city children--one of forty-four and the other of thirty-three--were compared to discover whether children who had attended balanced schools between first and third grades (the 44) achieved more than those who had attended balanced schools only since the start of third grade (the 33). In tests of paragraph meaning, word meaning, and arithmetic reasoning, the former were from five to fifteen percentile points ahead; on arithmetic computation, both groups had the same percentile rank. Unfortunately, the report did not present statistics measuring the absolute progress of these two groups on any of the four tests; accordingly, it is not possible to affirm or contradict the statement in the report that the group of forty-four "is achieving slighdy better."[1]

The White Plains report suffers from several weaknesses. First, no tests of statistical significance are presented so that the reported score differences cannot be properly evaluated. Second, there is reason to doubt that the comparisons are strictly racial. For example, when Rochambeau School was closed down in June, 1964, its enrollment was 61.7 percent Negro.[2] Thus, a considerable number of white students apparently lived in the attendance area and were enrolled in Rochambeau. Indeed, the Graves-Bedell report describes the inner city sample as "children, predominantly Negro, living in the center city ...."[3] Third, as pointed out above, in Comparison C no conclusion as to student progress can be reached because of the absence of data on absolute test scores. In all, the Graves-Bedell report failed to document adequately the educative value of the White Plains experiment in desegregation. It is equally clear that nothing in the report as presently written can be said to disprove the value of the White Plains experiment.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 30.

[2] White Plains Public Schools, "Analysis of Pupil Registration by School Showing Per Cent Negro." August 30, 1967.

[3] A Three Year Evaluation, p.3 (emphasis added).

Vane studied the effects of race on achievement in an unnamed suburban school district.[2] She was able to trace academic records from elementary through high school. Comparing two groups of nineteen Negro children, matched by I. Q. score and parent's occupation, Vane found no difference in achievement. It should be noted that this is not a study of a single group of students under conditions of segregation and desegregation. In a second study, Vane and associates found that matched groups of white and Negro children performed very similarly on subtest items of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test.[3] They noted, however, that the mean I. Q. score of the Negro group was 103. 3, considerably higher than the southern group tested by Kennedy and associates in 1960 and 1965. (See p. 20)

Klein, at the University of South Carolina, studied the initial effects of desegregation during an eight month period in a school in a southern metropolis.[1] Testing occurred at three schools: one recently desegregated, one all-Negro, and the other virtually all-white. Higher scores on mathematics and biology were first registered for Negro children in the desegregated school. When controls for parental occupation, family size, and parental education were applied, this superiority disappeared. Klein concluded that "the integrated school setting is neither educationally deleterious nor educationally beneficial for Negro students, at least over an eight-month period.[2] He observed also: "The academic achievement of matched groups of integrated white and integrated Negro students did not differ significantly.... The academic achievement of matched groups of segregated Negro students and integrated white students did not differ significantly."[3] This latter finding is startling; on the basis of it, a question can be reasonably raised about the randomness of the sample populations in the study.

---

[1] For an account of such an /invalid/ charge made by local critics of White Plains desegregation, see New York Times, November 10, 1967.

[2] Julia R. Vane, "Relation of Early School Achievement to High School Achievement When Race, Intelligence and Socioeconomic Factors Are Equated," Psychology in the Schools, 3 (1966), 124-129.

[3] Julia R. Vane, Jonathan Weitzman, and Adrian P. Applebaum, "Performance of Negro and White Children and Problem and Nonproblem Children on the Stanford Binet Scale," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 22 (1966).

[4] Ibid., p. 434.

In Waterloo, Iowa, Scott studied seriation-ability of 356 Negro and white kindergarten children under conditions of segregation and non-segregation.[4] The most significant difference was a very wide one between racial groups. So large was it that it swamped any difference arising from socioeconomic status. The development of seriating ability, which is closely connected with reading, was seen by Scott as possibly requiring "at least in integrated lower elementary classrooms... a lower teacher-pupil ratio, so that more individualized activities can be arranged in small groups."[1]

---

[1] Robert Stanley Klein, A Comparative Study of the Academic Achievement of Negro 10th Grade High School Students Attending Segregated and Recently Integrated Schools in a Metropolitan Area of the South (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15, 565).

[2] Ibid., p. 49.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ralph Scott, "Social Class, Race, Seriating and Reading Readiness: A Study of Their Relationship at the Kindergarten Level," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 115 (1969) 87-96.

The comparative academic achievement of 606 Negro and white high school students in Angleton, Texas, after a year of desegregation was analyzed by Bryant.[2] Table 3 summarizes achievement gains of both groups:[3]

TABLE 3 Changes in Total Scores on the Test of Academic Progress, May, 1966-May, 1967: By Race, Sex and Grade

Group	Increase in Standard Points	Statistical Significance
White	2.264	.01
Negro	1.255	.01
White boys	2.487	.01
White girls	2.017	.01
Negro boys	.833	NS
Negro girls	1.857	.01
White, 9th grade	1.250	.01
White, 10th grade	3.069	.01
White, 11th grade	2.951	.01
Negro, 9th grade	1.091	.05
Negro, 10th grade	1.605	.01
Negro, 11th grade	.885	NS

---

[1] Ibid., p. 95.

[2] James Chester Bryant, Some Effects of Racial Integration of High School Students on Standardized Achievement Test Scores, Teacher Grades, and Dropout Rates in Angleton, Texas (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-768).

[3] Ibid., 65, 69.

Bryant observed that he had not controlled for either intelligence or socioeconomic status.[1] Thus, what appear as racial differences are undoubtedly overstated. In light of this fact, it is noteworthy that Negro girls scored not far from the level of white girls. Bryant did not provide achievement scores for Negro and white students for the period prior to desegregation so it is not possible to ascertain whether the rate of achievement increased or declined as a result of desegregation.

Geiger, in another study at the University of South Carolina, reported on a research study done after one year of desegregation in a southern city. Instead of tracing the progress of individual children, he was concerned with the effect of racial composition of classes on achievement. He reported that "no significant relations were found between percentage of Negroes in the class and amount of achievement."[2] The results of the study, Geiger observed, "suggest that fears of necessary detrimental effects of desegregation on classroom achievement may not be firmly based."[3]

In a study of segregated and non-segregated schooling for K-second grade in a northern suburban community, Long found that attendance in one or another type of school did not affect academic achievement.[4] His subjects had always been enrolled in the schools they attended so no actual desegregation occurred. A hitherto-all-white school had simply been opened to all children. Negro subjects were classified as upper-lower class and the whites, lower-middle class. Controlling for socioeconomic status did not change Long's findings. In several respects, his study population was quite different from those reported elsewhere in this chapter. The Negro children were not severely disadvantaged; at both types of schools they scored at least at the national norms of the achievement tests; and they "had comparable staffs, facilities, and educational programs."[1] Long cautions:

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 57-58.

[2] Otis Glenn Geiger, Effects of Desegregation on Classroom Achievement (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1968), p. 27. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-5796).

[3] Ibid., p. 29.

[4] David Long, Educational Performance in Integrated and Segregated Elementary Schools (Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1968), p. 57. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-10, 982).

> The results of this study... should not be interpreted as a reason for maintaining segregation.... If benefits such as improved self-image, expanded social learnings, and increased motivation to learn can be accrued, then integrated schooling should be considered sound educational practice.[2]

Rosenfeld made a progress report from an ongoing longitudinal study of 316 Negro and 501 white students attending six schools in western and midwestern cities. In each city, Negro students score lowest on achievement tests and they represent a lower socioeconomic status. Nevertheless, writes Rosenberg, "there were tests in the battery and time periods during which Negro and white students grew at the same rates when initial differences between the groups were taken into account."[3]

In New York City, Slone studied the effect of a school pairing on achievement.[4] Negro students in the pairing scored significantly higher on arithmetic achievement tests than did Negro children in a segregated school. No significant differences showed up in any other achievement measures. Paired white children continued to learn at their previous level.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 80, 85.

[2] Ibid., p. 97.

[3] Michael Rosenfeld, Negro-White Differences in Intellectual Growth (August 30, 1968), p. 6 (ERIC #ED 024 073).

[4] Irene Wholl Slone, The Effects of One School Pairing on Pupil Achievement, Anxieties, and Attitudes (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 808).

Williams studied desegregation effects in Brevard County, Florida.[1] At the start of the 1964-1965 school year white and Negro students attending segregated high schools took a state-wide ninth grade achievement test. In 1965 the white high school was desegregated and a group of Negroes entered that school. In 1967-1968, the same students took the twelfth grade achievement test. While the desegregated Negro students continued to score lower than their white classmates, in five out of six achievement measures they scored significantly higher than the Negroes who remained in the segregated high school.[2]

Denmark and associates conducted a study of desegregation in a suburban New York community.[3] In 1965, eighty-seven lower class Negro children were transferred from a virtually all-Negro school which was being closed down to two schools attended primarily by white upper-middle class children. In the first year of desegregation, the Negro children in grades three to five increased their rate of achievement on verbal ability and narrowed the achievement gap in comparison with their white classmates.[4] This held good for both girls and boys. Negro boys in grades one and two were, in turn, much closer to their classmates in verbal ability. The Denmark team drew two conclusions: One, that the earlier desegregation occurred, the better. Two, that integration and compensatory education work best together. An interesting contrast with Long's study is the fact that, according to Denmark, "the Negro and white segregated schools were comparable in staff and equipment."[1] Yet, in Long's study equal school facilities led to no achievement benefit. In this case, they did. Perhaps the reason lies in the fact that in the present case, Negro children were actually desegregated.

---

[1] Frank E. Williams, An Analysis of Some Differences Between Negro High School Seniors From a Segregated High School and a Nonsegregated High School in Brevard County, Florida (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-16, 050).

[2] Ibid., pp. 44-53.

[3] Florence L. Denmark, Marcia Guttentag, and Robert Riley, Communication Patterns in Integrated Classrooms and Pre-Integration Subject Variables as They Affect the Academic Achievement and Self-Concept of Previously Segregated Children, August, 1967. (ERIC # ED 016 721).

[4] Ibid., p. 13.

In another study, Denmark and Guttentag studied possible achievement effects of non-segregated pre-schooling on four-year-old Negro children. (Apparently, this research occurred in the same place as the preceding study.) Four pre-school groups were organized, only one of which was integrated. The sixty-three experimental subjects scored higher than did seventeen children in a control group. "A good, creative, enjoyable learning climate," concluded the researchers, "may be more important than the specific composition of the experience."[2]

An inquiry into desegregation in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, was conducted by Prichard.[3] He studied student achievement in grades five, seven and nine and compared this with achievement in a segregated school. Negro achievement during a year of segregation rose significantly in mathematics at grades five and seven; and for white students at grade five. Reading scores did not show any significant increase.

Wessman evaluated the "A Better Chance" ABC program.[1] Under it, disadvantaged boys, most of them Negroes, entered private secondary schools on scholarships. Wessman selected a sample of twenty-three matched pairs, nineteen of them Negro. Nearly two-thirds of their fathers were unskilled or semi-skilled manual laborers. After two years, eighty percent of the entrants were still enrolled, and were attending thirty-nine different schools. One-fifth had done outstanding or a very good academic work, another fifth, failing work, and over half, average. The ABC boys had come predominantly from urban schools where they had functioned as good students. "The change in academic environments," noted Wessman, "probably would not result in much of an increment in their basic abilities."[2] On both achievement and intelligence tests, neither the ABC nor the control group showed any "dramatic" change. Whether or not the ABC boys had attended a segregated or an integrated school before transferring seemed to have no effect on their performance in the new schools. (The experience was far more fruitful for its non-academic aspects; see below, p.77). Wessman's analysis is notable for its hardheadedness in an area where sentimentality has all too many attractions.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 34.

[2] Florence L. Denmark and Marcia Guttentag, "Effect of Integrated and Non-Integrated Programs on Cognitive Change in Pre-School Children," Perceptual and Motor Skills, 29 (1969), 379.

[3] Paul N. Prichard, "Effects of Desegregation on Student Success in the Chapel Hill City Schools," Integrated Education, 7 (1969) 33-37.

During 1965-1967, eight highly selective women's colleges[3] admitted 168 black students in a special program. Wilson reported on their academic record after the first year.[4] In a word, they operated somewhat below expectation, given their entrance test scores. These students

---

1. Alden E. Wessman, Evaluation of Project ABC (A Better Chance). An Evaluation of Dartmouth College--Independent Schools Scholarship Program for Disadvantaged High School Students, April, 1969 (ERIC # ED 031 549).

2. Ibid., p. 110.

3. These were: Briarcliff, Connecticut, Hollins, Mount Holyoke, Randolph-Macon Women's, Trinity (D.C.), Vassar, and Wheaton (Mass.) Colleges.

4. Kenneth M. Wilson, Black Students Entering CRC Colleges: Their Characteristics and Their First-Year Academic Performance, April 15, 1969 (ERIC # ED 030 897).

were a very highly selected group. Twenty-nine percent of their fathers had completed college. Two-thirds of them scored 500 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test-Verbal (SAT-V) in contrast with only one-fiftieth of all black high school seniors who took the test.[1] Ironically, these students are known in some school circles as "high risk"!

Two recent studies have been made of the desegregation-via-busing in Hartford, Connecticut, known as Project Concern. Inner-city children, mostly Negroes, attend suburban schools. Wood studied their academic achievement a year later after selecting a sample, matched on WISC-Verbal I. Q. scores. Grades covered were K-5. A summary of the findings for the experimental group follows:[2]

Grades K-1: Achievement in arithmetic, vocabulary, and verbal I. Q. increased.

Grades 2-3: Total performance on I. Q. increased significantly.

Grades 4-5: Vocabulary score increased significantly. While gains were not sweeping, the overall direction was clear. Achievement of white children in the receiving schools held up without exception. The Mahans reported on Hartford after two years of Project Concern. In the experiment youngsters in grades K-three, they stated, "had significantly different (and higher) scores on measures of mental ability and achievement generally."[3] More significant, however, cognitive functioning in general improved among the Negro children. The Mahans explain:[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 15.

[2] Bruce Hartley Wood, The Effects of Busing Versus Non-Busing on the Intellectual Functioning of Inner City, Disadvantaged Elementary School Children (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1969), p. 60-66. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-5186).

[3] Aline M. Mahan and Thomas W. Mahan, "Changes in Cognitive Style: An Analysis of the Impace of White Suburban Schools on Inner City Children," Integrated Education, 8 (1970), 60.

[4] Ibid., pp. 60-61.

> The direction of this impact is toward greater verbal productivity, increased accuracy in the associative and sorting processes, and an enhanced willingness to take a risk in terms of verbal responses to situations.... There are indications that there is a tendency toward better understanding of expectations (i.e., better test-taking skill), increased self-discipline, and increased ability to evaluate responses in terms of external standards....

These outcomes are viewed by the Mahans as evidence of the beneficial effects of environment on learning.

An informal report of desegregation effects on learning in Rome, Georgia was included in a report of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In that report, school authorities told of Negro tenth graders learning gain during their first year of desegregation. Apparently, they gained a full year or so while their former classmates in the segregated school registered no gain at all.[1] There was no mention of controlling for ability or socioeconomic differences.

The same source conducted a survey of thirteen school districts in Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee. No objective measures of academic achievement were available. However, it was reported:[2]

> Seven out of the ten Negro students attending desegregated schools felt that they were receiving better schooling than they had received in the segregated schools.... Negro parents were even more pleased.... Only 20 of the 205 white teachers...

---

[1] Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Much Better Than They Expected," Integrated Education, 8 (1970), 47.

[2] Ibid.,

> felt that there had been some loss of standards and of the rate of progress of their classes.

The study had been conducted in spring, 1969, and a total of 1,230 persons were interviewed.

A rather special interracial learning situation was the Upward Bound Project. At the University of Toledo, a U.P. summer project was followed by a year of follow-up, mainly tutorials. Students came from two inner-city high schools in Toledo, Ohio, and from one in Lucas County. Analysis by Geisler showed a significant improvement in self-concept and achievement as measured by Grade Point Average."[1] Jawa studied an U.B. project at the University of Oregon and found evidence of academic progress.[2] Racial tensions, however, almost tore the group apart.[3] A less favorable achievement record was made at yet another U.B. project.[4]

A formal evaluation of the on-going comprehensive desegregation program in Evanston, Illinois, is still underway. Thus far, the only published statement on possible achievement effects is the following: "Certainly, no evidence that the academic performance of white students has been harmed or that the academic performance of black children has been appreciably improved as a result of desegregation has come to the attention of project staff at this time."[1]

---

[1] John Stanley Geisler, The Effects of A Compensatory Education Program on the Self-Concept and Academic Achievement of High School Age Youth from Low Income Families (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toledo, 1968), p. 85. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-3425).

[2] Manmohan Singh Jawa, Academic Development, Group Dynamics, and Motivation Variables of Disadvantaged Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-28).

[3] Ibid., p. 46.

[4] David E. Hunt and Robert H. Hardt, "The Effect of Upward Bound Programs on the Attitudes, Motivation, and Academic Achievement of Negro Students," Journal of Social Issues, 25 (1969) 128-129.

Evaluation of various desegregation arrangements in Rochester, New York, continued through a second year. As in the previous year, white students in "receiving" schools continued to learn at their customary rate. Within the same school, a significant learning advantage accrued to students in integrated rather than in segregated classes; this finding supported that of the year before. On the other hand--and contrary to the previous year--integrated classes did not continue to show achievement superiority over segregated classes with a component of compensatory education.[2]

In Buffalo, New York, Banks and Di Pasquale found that Negro pupils achieved significantly more when bused to a predominantly white school than did their peers who remained in the all-Negro school.[3] After making certain undescribed adjustments with the basic data, the researchers reported that in classrooms whose racial composition exceeded thirty percent black, achievement equalled that registered in an all-black classroom. Unfortunately, it is not possible to accept or reject this finding without knowing (1) what was the "correction factor" that was applied to the unadjusted achievement scores? (2) what were the unadjusted scores? (3) what variables were

---

[1] Daniel P. Norton and Jayjia Hsia, Evaluation of Integration of Evanston District 65 Schools. Interim Report (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, June, 1969), pp. 28-29.

[2] Herman R. Goldberg, John H. Griffith, Russell F. Green, and Orrin H. Bowman, An Interim Report on a Fifteen Point Plan to Reduce Racial Isolation and Provide Quality Integrated Education (Rochester, New York: Board of Education, July, 1969), pp. 29-30.

[3] Ronald Banks and Mary Ellen Di Pasquale, A Study of the Educational Effectiveness of Integration (Buffalo, New York: Buffalo Public Schools, January, 1969), p. 1.

"corrected" for? (4) what was the socioeconomic status of the white children in predominantly black classrooms? and (5) how were the transferred children selected? None of this information is supplied. A possible check on the Buffalo finding would entail studying academic achievement of Negro children in predominantly Negro schools where "reverse open enrollment" has existed over a period of time. Such an example is the Clara Barton School in Rochester, New York.[1]

IV. STUDIES OF BUSING

Busing programs are usually designed for practical ends--improved instruction, relief of overcrowding, and desegregation--rather than research purposes. Thus, little or no time is commonly taken beforehand to provide for a systematic research exploration of the variables at work. For the most part, the available studies of busing have been hardly more than retrospective retracings of isolated variables. Nevertheless, their quality varies and some are more instructive than others.

The East Harlem Project conducted a study of the busing of Puerto Rican and Negro children from two East Harlem schools to a white middle class Yorkville school.[2] A majority of children were reported to show "dramatic improvement in their school work, and in their attendance."[3]

Moorefield found no achievement effects of desegregation via busing in Kansas City, Missouri.[4] The actual extent of desegregation, however, remains to be clarified. Students from six predominantly Negro schools were bused to twelve receiving schools. One of the latter--Attucks--had a Negro enrollment of 65.8 percent before busing and 99.3 percent after busing.[1] Another--Pershing--had 35.8 percent before and 42.8 percent after. Out of the total transported of 1,271, one-fifth--256--were bused to Attucks and Pershing.[2] Achievement data, unfortunately, are not reported by individual school. Bused children came from families whose socioeconomic status and/or education was above average. Hammond, Sawhill, and Williams studied 224 Negro students who participated in a busing program in Seattle.[3] The students were drawn from ten schools and entered thirty-two schools. While their attendance records improved sharply in their new schools, their school record as measured by grades suffered: "... 43 percent of the total group are doing poorer than they did last year, 41 percent are doing the same, and 6 percent are doing better."[4] Because no achievement test scores are reported, however, it is not possible to know whether the absolute achievement of bused children rose or fell.

---

[1] See Goldberg and others, An Interim Report on a Fifteen Point Plan, p. 6.

[2] East Harlem Project and City Commission on Human Rights, Releasing Human Potential. A Study of East Harlem-Yorkville School Bus Transfer (New York: City Commission on Human Rights, 1962)

[3] Ibid., p.2.

[4] Thomas Earl Moorefield, The Busing of Minority Group Children in a Big City School System (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1967), pp. 145-147.

In Syracuse, New York, two busing programs were evaluated by the school system. In the first, a group of Negro children were bused from Croton to Edward Smith School. At the end of the school year, white children at Smith showed their customary achievement gain. The bused children failed to gain any more than the children who had

---

1. See Table 2, ibid., p. 25.

2. See Table 1, ibid., p. 22.

3. Alpha J. Hammond, Lucy M. Sawhill, and Robert B. Williams, A Survey of the Adjustment of the Negro Students Who Transferred to Schools Outside Their Neighborhoods During 1963-1964 Under the New Seattle School Board Ruling (Master's thesis, University of Washington, 1964)

4. Ibid., p. 48

remained at Croton.[1] In the second program, students from Croton were bused to Washington Irving School. As in the previous case, white children at the host school continued to improve in reading at their customary rate. The children from Croton, however, gained significantly more than the children who remained in Croton. The 30 bused pupils achieved a mean growth in months of 8.53, the non-bused children, 4.17.[2]

Jonsson studied various aspects of a busing program in Berkeley, California.[3] Certain schools attended by concentrations of children from poverty families were desegregated as "target schools," and received special aid under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. A group of students from the target schools were bused to predominantly white schools. Jonsson reported that the 1966-1967 achievement scores for bused pupils "were above the average of target pupils, and their growth increased this achievement differential...."[4] The bused students had been somewhat above the average at the target schools. On the other hand, Jonsson declares that "their gains...

---

[1] Research Department, City School District, Syrachuse, New York, "Study of the Effect of Integration--Croton and Edward Smith Elementary School School Pupils," pp. 327-328 in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Hearing Held in Rochester, New York, September 16-17, 1966 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967)

[2] Research Department, City School District, Syracuse, New York, "Study of the Effect of Integration--Washington Irving and Host Pupils," pp. 323-326 in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Hearing Held in Rochester, New York, September 16-17, 1966 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967).

[3] Harold A. Jonsson, Report of Evaluation of ESEA Title I Compensatory Activities for 1966-67 (Berkeley, California: Berkeley Unified School District, 1967).

[4] Ibid., p.11.

are consistently greater than one would predict from initial differences."[1]

Teele, Jackson, and Mayo reported on a preliminary study of Operation Exodus, a voluntary busing program in Boston.[2] One hundred three mothers of children in the program were interviewed during February-June, 1966. Many mothers cited two bits of evidence as indices of improved education: the bused children were being assigned more homework and far fewer children reported having substitute teachers than had been the case in their old schools.

Beker, in the study described earlier, had reported that a one-year busing program in Syracuse had not brought about any significant improvement in academic achievement by the bused children. A later study, done by Ayer, "showed that the reading achievement of bused pupils was significantly higher after one year than was that of a matched comparison group at the predominantly Negro school even though there had been no difference between the groups in reading achievement at the beginning of the year."[3]

V. EVALUATION STUDIES

In New York City, several experimental programs have been inaugurated within the school system with the formal purpose of providing "quality integrated education." At least one other project that included this purpose originally later dropped it. (More Effective Schools program).

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] James E. Teele, Ellen Jackson, and Clara Mayo, "Family Experiences in Operation Exodus," pp. 297-314 in U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Hearing Held in Boston, Massachusetts, October 4-5, 1966 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967); see also, Dan Woods, "A Brief History of Operation Exodus," Integrated Education, October-November, 1966.

[3] Beker, A Study of Integration, p. 383.

Here is a list of such integration programs which have been evaluated in any formal sense:[1]

1. Free Choice Open Enrollment: Elementary and Junior High Schools
2. Community Zoning Program (Pairing)
3. Grade Reorganization Preparatory to the Establishment of the Comprehensive High School
4. A Special Enrichment Program of Quality Integrated Education for Schools in Transitional Areas.

The evaluations of these programs are almost without value for the present research purposes. Ethnic data are sometimes reported school-by-school but never by classroom. Achievement data, however, always are reported by grade groups or simply in two gross tables: Negro-Puerto Rican and Other. The student cannot tell what relationships exist between achievement and ethnicity. Nor can one probe into unusually promising practices at this or that school. Socioeconomic controls are rarely if ever specified and so changes can as easily be attributed to one factor as another.

---

[1] Evaluations covering the school year 1965-1966 are: David J. Fox, Free Choice Open Enrollment--Elementary Schools (New York: Center for Urban Education, August 31, 1966) and Robert L. Thorndike, Free Choice Open Enrollment--Junior High Schools (New York: Center for Urban Education, August 31, 1966). Summaries of the Center for Urban Education evaluation for 1966-1967 are in Bernard E. Donovan's Summary of Proposed Programs 1967-1968. Title I--Elementary and Secondary Education Act (New York: Board of Education, August 30, 1967), pp. 99-103.

See Evaluation of the Community Zoning Program. Summary Report (New York Board of Education, September, 1966).

See "Grade Reorganization Preparatory to the Establishment of the Comprehensive High School," July 31, 1967, a 5½-page typewritten draft summary report prepared, apparently, by the Center for Urban Education.

See "A Special Enrichment Program of Quality Integrated Education for Schools in Transitional Areas," in Donovan, Summary of Proposed Programs, pp. 110-113, prepared by the Center for Urban Education.

It should be clear that the present report is examining the evaluations only from the viewpoint of their research importance. The evaluative studies may or may not be, in addition, perfectly good scholarly products as legally required formal evaluations. In any event, none of these evaluations can be considered as having provided a research test of any of the types of programs under evaluation. A limited research use of these and related studies can be made where closely similar programs are being compared and the specific outcome of the programs is the point of interest.[1] In their defense, too, it should be observed that the evaluation staff was often called in almost as an afterthought. This is not a very favorable setting for meaningful research.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Let us now return to the question that opened this chapter: How has racial desegregation affected academic achievement? The evidence is strong that desegregation improves the academic achievement of Negro children. In a few cases, desegregation did not provide such stimulation;

---

[1] See, for example, the use made of data on the More Effective Schools Program and the Community Zoning Program in Meyer Weinberg, Report on Techniques for Achieving Racially Desegregated Superior Quality Education in the Public Schools of Chicago, Illinois (unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, October 23, 1967).

and in a rare case or two, Negro children's achievement fell. The evidence is even stronger that white children fail to suffer any learning disadvantage from desegregation. These positive conclusions are supported, in turn, by the U. S. Office of Education Coleman Report and the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights Racial Isolation report, discussed below in Chapter 6.

If, however, the fact of accomplishment under desegregation is clear, the reasons for the accomplishment are by no means clear. The next question we must consider is: Why has racial desegregation had a positive learning effect on Negro children? We thereupon necessarily enter the far more complicated and subtle arena of motivation, feelings, and aspirations.

CHAPTER 3

ASPIRATIONS AND SELF-CONCEPT

Aspirations and self-concept are at the core of the motivation to learn. Yet, little is known about their role in education. Through a process of circular reasoning, these elements are almost always viewed as properties of individual students. That is, if children are learning they are assumed to be expressing some degree of aspiration and a more or less sound self-concept. If they are not learning satisfactorily, there is an automatic tendency to attribute the failing to a lack of motivation. This, in turn, is often translated low aspirations and poor self-concept.

What, however, is to be made of the situation where aspirations are high and self-concept is sound--and still no satisfactory learning occurs? Attention should then shift away from the isolated child toward social factors--race is pre-eminent among these--for possible light on the subject.

In the remainder of the chapter a number of studies dealing with both aspirations and self-concept are reviewed. To be sure, there is no line between the two. Nevertheless, for purposes of analysis it is convenient to separate them. In the next chapter, the group or intergroup aspects of aspiration and self-concept are discussed.

1. ASPIRATIONS

"There is," writes Coleman, "a peculiar and ill-understood phenomenon that appears to characterize many Negroes, adults and youth: a high, unrealistic, idealized aspiration, relatively unconnected to those actions that ordinarily lead to achievement of a goal."[1]

---

[1] James S. Coleman, Race Relations and Social Change (Baltimore, Maryland: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, July, 1967), p. 31.

Five years earlier, the Ausubels had summarized research as indicating that the depressed social and personal condition of Negro youths led to low academic and vocational aspirations.[1] Thus, in a short five year period, scientific opinion had shifted from a model of low to high Negro aspirations.

The shift in opinion was by no means arbitrary. Between 1962 and 1967 especially, Negro Americans had in fact formulated a new self-awareness that shot their aspirations sky-high.[2] To aspire is to hope, and the civil rights movement symbolized new hope for the oppressed. The realism and practicality of the rising aspirations are, of course, open to examination. It should, however, be noted that the same can be said about all of man's hopes.

In the past, what appeared to be low aspirations by Negro youth sometimes turned out to be quite something else. As Logan reported a generation ago:

> In the Boston public school system a few white teachers, who hardly act on their own initiative, are becoming increasingly bolder in their efforts to discourage colored students from going to the college preparatory high schools and to white colleges. In one school, a separate assembly of colored students was ordered for the purpose of extolling to them the virtues of manual training and of colored schools.[3]

---

[1] David P. and Pearl Ausubel, "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children," in Harry A. Passow (ed), Education in Depressed Areas (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963), p. 118

[2] See, for example, Thomas F. Pettigrew, A Profile of the Negro American (Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1964), p. 184.

[3] Rayford W. Logan, "Educational Segregation in the North," Journal of Negro Education (January, 1933), p. 65.

The example was not unique.

Even before the sixties, however, some studies reported higher vocational and/or educational aspirations among Negro than among white youth.[1] In 1952, for example, Boyd's study of Portland, Oregon, matched white and Negro students by socioeconomic status and I. Q. and still found Negro children to have the higher aspirations.[2]

During the early fifties, Goff studied vocational aspirations of Negro youth in Durham, North Carolina. They ranged in age from six to eight years and twelve to fourteen years. She found that "feelings of confidence are expressed more often than not, positive attitudes of competence exist more frequently than negative ones, ambitions are directed toward occupations which yield substantial economic returns, success in areas of performance are most often expected, and wishes generally are in terms of further self-enhancement."[3] Their personal experience of ego-deflation had not led them to doubt their own personal capacity to advance economically and socially. On the other hand, among the children in the upper-income level of the sample, boys were less optimistic about their chances. Goff explained the greater realism by noting that among boys "there is more movement and mingling outside the home and classroom with greater opportunity for sharp person to person comparisons and increased awareness of group standards. Outlooks, as a result, are less hopeful,"[1]

---

[1] 1. See, for example, Suzanne Keller and Marisa Zavalloni, "Ambition and Social Class: A Respecification," Social Forces, October, 1964.

[2] 2. G. F. Boyd, "The Levels of Aspiration of White and Negro Children in a Non-Segregated Elementary School," Journal of Social Psychology, XXXVI, 1952. An indication that the situation in Portland was unchanged some twelve years later is in Committee on Race and Education, Race and Equal Educational Opportunity in Portland's Public Schools (Portland: Board of Education, October 29, 1964) p. 122.

[3] 3. Regina M. Goff, "Some Educational Implications of the Influence of Rejection on Aspiration Levels of Minority Group Children," Journal of Experimental Education, December, 1954, p. 181.

Grier conducted a follow-up study, five years later, of the 1956 graduating class of all-Negro Dunbar high school in Washington, D.C. At that time, the school was known to be one of the best of its kind in the country. At graduation, a large majority of the students said they wanted to enter a profession. In 1961, however, only one-fourth were still so aspiring. Only seven of the forty-six Dunbar graduates had earned a bachelor's degree but seventy-one in all continued in college. Grier comments on one aspect of the outcome: "Since the home environment itself offered little in the way of useful career advice, it is possible that the aid offered by the school was inadequate to the unusually stringent demands upon it."[2]

Nam, Rhodes, and Herriott analyzed data from the decennial censuses as well as later data collected by the Census Bureau relating to unequal educational opportunities. Some of their findings relevant to aspirations follow:[3]

> Among white-collar families, Negroes are far more likely /than whites/ to plan on going to college; among lower-status families, the racial difference

---

[1] Ibid., p. 182.

[2] Eunice S. Grier, In Search of a Future. A Pilot Study of the the Career-Seeking Experiences of Selected High School Graduates in Washington, D.C. (Washington, D.C.: Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, January, 1963), p. iv.

[3] Charles B. Nam, A. Lewis Rhodes and Robert E. Herriott, Inequalities in Educational Opportunities. A Demographic Analysis of Educational Diferences in the Population (Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State University, May, 1966), p. 57.

> is small and favors Negroes.... There is a tendency for Negro students to plan for a higher level of education than their mothers expect them to attain (especially in lower-status families). The study reveals a large discrepancy between the enrollment status and the plans of students in the low-income and non-white-collar groups of the central cities--particularly for Negroes. The majority of the students in these groups say they plan to go to college, yet it is just these groups that have the highest rates of nonenrollment.

The researchers did not restrict these generalizations to any special section of the country.

Since 1960, a number of more or less controlled studies have been made of Negro-white differences in aspiration, both under conditions of school segregation and desegregation.

Blake studied level of aspiration in a suburban area near a large Midwestern city.[1] He matched three groups of students on socioeconomic status, I.Q. and achievement:

Group W: 59 white students from integrated high schools

Group N1: 59 Negro students from integrated high schools

Group NS: 59 Negro students from segregated high schools

In the integrated schools, Negroes were a minority but the schools were not transitional to Negro. The school administrators were reputedly fair to Negro children.

Blake set out to test four hypotheses:[2]

> 1. On the average, Negro pupils will have higher levels of aspiration than those of their white counterparts in the mixed school situation.

---

[1] Elias Blake, Jr., A Comparison of Intraracial and Interracial Levels of Aspiration (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1960) (University Microfilms Order No. 60-1616).

[2] Ibid., pp. 27-28.

2. There will be greater variability in the aspirations of the minority group in the segregated school system than in the mixed school system

3. The Negro pupils in the mixed school sample will show a higher average level of aspiration than the Negroes in segregated school samples.

4. The average aspiration will be approximately the same for whites and the segregated school group, but there will be greater variability in the segregated Negro group.

Let us now examine the findings.

Negro students in integrated schools did set higher aspirational levels than did their white fellow students. The first hypothesis was thus supported. On the other hand, the second hypothesis was rejected. Negro students in the segregated schools did not set a wider range of aspirational levels than both other groups; indeed, they set fewer low aspiration levels than either Negroes or whites in integrated schools. The third hypothesis was also rejected. Negroes in the integrated schools failed to set higher average aspirational levels than Negroes in segregated schools. Finally, the fourth hypothesis was rejected inasmuch as segregated Negro students had higher average levels of aspiration than did whites in integrated schools. The segregated Negro students were the highest aspiring of all three groups.

Blake interprets the high aspirations of segregated Negroes as a defensive measure whereby the student attempts to maintain his self-esteem. To set a low goal might be interpreted by others as an admission of lower self-esteem. It is not desegregation but segregation, in Blake's opinion, that threatens the Negro's self-esteem: "The more rigidly segregated total environment is much more constantly devaluing to the Negro."[1] Blake rejects an alternative explanation which holds that because the segregated school is a protective environment against the harsh reality of discrimination, Negro children find it "safer to set high goals with or without expecting to attain them."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 69.

Be that as it may, two points should be kept in mind. One, that integrated Negro students of like intelligence, socioeconomic status, and achievement set higher aspirational levels than did their white counterparts. Two, despite the matching, the segregated Negro children responded defensively. They were, in other words, not able to accept themselves as realistically as did the integrated Negro students.

In 1960 Wilson studied the social aspects of aspirations in the public schools of Berkeley, California.[2] He had three aims: "... To determine the extent of the differences in social composition between the elementary schools, to confirm the relationship between familal background and academic achievement and aspirations, but, particularly, to investigate how the differing school milieux might modify this relationship."[3]

Wilson found, as expected, that children of higher social status achieved more than did children of a lower status. More interestingly, however, he also found that children from roughly similar social backgrounds achieved along a wide range. A key to these discrepancies turned out to be what might be called the social geography of the Berkeley schools: families of the highest social status were concentrated in the Hills; of the next highest, in the Foothills, and of the lowest, in the Flats. At the same time, each geographical area also contained some families of every social group. In speaking of academic achievement, Wilson reports: "The children of professionals in the Foothills attained a poorer average than their compeers in the Hills; the children of manual workers in the Foothills, almost equalling the white-collar group in the same schools, were far superior to those in the Flats."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 71.

[2] Alan B. Wilson, The Effect of Residential Segregation Upon Educational Achievement and Aspirations (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1960). See, also, Wilson, "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," American Sociological Review, December, 1959.

[3] Ibid., p. 19.

In other words, academic achievement was found to depend not on broad social status affiliation but on the social climate of the school. Children of the same social background achieved more if they attended a higher-status school. This held for children of every social status. At the same time, Wilson discovered that teachers tended to allocate school marks according to social class criteria. In lower-status schools, where teachers employed lower academic standards, children of high status received as many A's and B's, for example, as did their social counterparts in upper status schools.

When it comes to aspirations, according to Wilson, social status factors do not operate in as clear-cut a manner. In fact, "more Negroes in the Flats, where they are a majority, have high aspirations, than in the Foothills, where they are a minority."[2] School children, however, tend to adopt the aspirations of their peers. In the Flats, each child has much more contact with other children who do not aspire to college, for example. And the non-college aspirants make up a very cohesive group. "Relatively, then, terminal students are the social leaders in the lower socioeconomic strata. They gain social support from their peers, and, in turn, set the pace for them, without adopting the standards of success prevalent in the wider community of adults."[3] In the Hills more children are isolates whose very isolation protects their high aspirations from the corrosive effect of low achievers.

---

1. Ibid., p. 49.
2. Ibid., p. 67.
3. Ibid., p. 99

Wilson views the segregation of Negroes in Berkeley schools from the standpoint of constructive group functioning. The presence of high aspirations among lower-class Negroes demonstrates "that a segregated social minority can generate and maintain higher hopes than when integrated. It can develop its indigenous leadership, and is not demoralized by continuous tokens of their imposed inferiority."[1] Clearly, a fundamental conflict exists between Blake's and Wilson's interpretations of the psychological content of segregation. Blake, as we have seen, regarded segregation as "constantly devaluing to the Negro" whereas Wilson states that segregation prevents demoralization of the segregated. A crucial question remains: Is the sense of "imposed inferiority" more intense under segregation than under integration? The weight of the evidence presented in the remainder of this chapter probably supports the view that segregation is more destructive.

Geisel studied Negro and white aspirations in Nashville, Tennessee.[2] He compared 1,245 white with 777 Negro students in seventh, eighth and twelfth grades. While white students had a significantly higher mean I.Q. score (108.2 and 89.7) Negro vocational and educational goals were significantly higher.[3] Geisel observed that significant differences between Negroes and whites existed not only in I.Q. and aspiration scores, but also with respect to "participation patterns, attitudes and self- and life-concept dimensions for both upper and lower socioeconomic status group."[4]

Extracurricular school activities were distinctly white specialties. Negro students, on the other hand, were highly active in the Negro community. (It should be recalled that Nashville in this period was a leading center of southern civil rights activity.) As Geisel put it: "The school is a status symbol but the outside activities are where Negroes can enjoy life."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 68.

[2] Paul N. Geisel, I.Q. Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southern City: A Racial Comparison (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962) (University Microfilms Order No. 63-1838).

[3] Ibid., pp. 64-5.

[4] Ibid., p. 169.

Within the school itself, the teacher plays a most important role for the Negro child:

> The teacher for the white child is likely to be simply an instrumental agent of the school. For the Negro child she also represents a status position and a respected social role.... The Negro child who feels he is important in the eyes of the teacher is optimistic about the future and also thinks that education is very important. This pattern is much less pronounced for white youth.[2]

By inference, the significantly higher self-concept scores registered by Negroes might well reflect this more personal meaning of school and especially of the teacher.

The values of the Negro subcommunity are reflected in vocational choices of Negro youth. About half of the Negro students said they wanted to become teachers, physicians, lawyers, social workers, ministers, morticians, and nurses.[3] These are vocations that can be practiced directly within the Negro community. A recent study seemed to interpret Geisel's finding about concentration in "Negro" careers as a southern phenomenon.[4] Bindman, in his study of Negro students at the University of Illinois, found the same more or less true in the North: "(1) Negro students are occupationally oriented in selecting their colleges and courses of study, and (2) Negro students select careers in which they can be reasonably certain of finding renumerative employment."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 283.

[2] Ibid., p. 211.

[3] Ibid., p. 280.

[4] James G. Maddox with E. E. Liebhafsky, Vivian W. Henderson, and Herbert M. Hamlin, The Advancing South. Manpower Prospects and Problems (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1967), pp. 144-145.

Yet, the psychological threat of the white community takes it toll, especially as evidenced by responses by twelfth grade students in Geisel's sample. By that time, Negro-white differences in educational aspirations have largely disappeared. Tests on students' perception of anomie and blocks for the future show the greatest sensitivity "in twelfth grade where contact and potential competition with whites in the occupations world is imminent."[2] Realism marks the choice of fields of vocational concentration as it marks the apprehensiveness felt by the soon-to-be graduate.

Over a period of one year, P.S. 198 in Manhattan, a six-grade school, was desegregated. The student body was divided: one half Puerto Rican, one third Negro, and one sixth other. Children were tested in October, 1960, and June, 1961.[3] Their vocational aspirations were found to vary with the social composition of the classroom. Without exception, when children were an ethnic minority in a classroom, fewer chose a professional or semi-professional occupation. The tendency was strongest among Negroes and weakest among white non-Puerto Ricans. In addition, both Negro and Puerto Rican students were more expressive in classes in which they were a minority than a majority. White non-Puerto Ricans showed an opposite tendency.

Powell studied the aspirations of talented Negro youth in the segregated schools of Alabama.[4]

---

[1] Bindman, Participation of Negro Students in An Integrated University, p. 47.

[2] Geisel, p. 284.

[3] Harold S. Goldblatt and Cyril Tyson, Some Self Perceptions and Teacher Evaluations of Puerto Rican, Negro, and White Pupils in 4th, 5th, and 6th grades, Research Report No. 12 (New York: City Commission on Human Rights, 1962)

[4] Christus N. Powell, Factors Affecting the Educational and Vocational Plans of High Ability Negro Students in the High Schools of Alabama (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1963) (University Microfilms Order No.64-5382)

His sample was one hundred eleventh and twelfth grade students who scored very high on the California Test of Mental Maturity: above the 85th percentile on the national norm and between the 93rd and 99th percentiles on Alabama statewide norms.[1] Nearly forty of the 100 did not plan to attend college. As several of them explained to Powell: "I don't have the money to attend college and if I did attend all I could do would be to teach school or carry mail."[2] Of the eighty-one planning to attend college, forty-six hoped to attend a desegregated college; all but four of this group hoped to attend such a college outside the South. (Data were collected during 1959; several years after, probably even more of the students would have considered desegregated colleges.)

Three factors were found to influence a student's decision to seek a college education: (1) college attendance by a sibling; (2) the presence of a counselor in the high school; and (3) strong maternal approval. The decision was not dependent on the father's occupation or income.

Vocational aspirations were heavily in the direction of teaching: fifty-eight percent of the boys and forty-one percent of the girls.[3] Nearly three quarters of the non-college bound boys wanted to learn a skilled trade.[4]

Gist and Bennett investigated aspirations in four Kansas City high schools; 412 Negro students were compared with 461 white students.[5] When I.Q. and socioeconomic status were held constant, no significant differences existed in either occupational or educational aspiration. Geisel had found significant differences between Negro and white and declared: "... We have rediscovered sub-culture."[6] Gist and Bennett, however, declare flatly: "... This study seems to add to the growing evidence that there is no such thing as a Negro sub-culture when general attitudes toward occupations or education are the focus of attention."[1] Part of the difference between these two conclusions may lie with the degree that socioeconomic influences were controlled. Gist and Bennett claim only to have "crudely controlled"[2] such influences while Geisel states that his Negro and white subjects "are obviously not truly comparable."[3] The difference may also be explained by the fact that Negro populations were studied.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 9.

[2] Ibid., p. 44.

[3] Ibid., p. 89.

[4] Ibid., p. 94.

[5] Noel P. Gist and William S. Bennett, "Aspirations of Negro and White Students," Social Forces, October, 1963.

[6] Geisel, p. 279.

Gottlieb studied Negro-white differences in aspirations and fulfillment in seven high schools.[4] His sample was divided into four types of students:

1. All students in two all-Negro high schools in the South.
2. All students in two all-white high schools in the South.
3. A twenty-five percent sample of Negro and white students in a northern interracial high school.
4. A twenty-five percent sample of Negro students in an all-Negro high school in the North.

Negroes had higher college-going aspirations, and Negroes from southern segregated schools had higher aspirations than Negroes in the interracial northern school. Expectations diverged from aspirations; the two were less discrepant among southern Negro students, more discrepant among Negroes in interracial schools.

---

[1] Gist and Bennett, p. 44.

[2] Ibid., p. 45.

[3] Geisel, p. 210.

[4] David Gottlieb, "Goal Aspirations and Goal Fulfillments: Differences Between Deprived and Affluent American Adolescents," unpublished paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, March 19, 1964. See, also, Gottlieb, "Poor Youth Do Want to Be Middle Class. But It's Not Easy," Personnel and Guidance Journal, October, 1967.

Gottlieb then probed the relationship between goal fulfillment and teachers. It was hypothesized that student-teacher involvement would be at its peak "where the student perceived goal consensus and an ability as well as desire on the part of the teacher in the goal-attainment process."[1]

White students tended to believe that they and their teachers shared common goals, this tendency was strengthened as social class of student rose. Negroes, however, tended to see a discrepancy between their goals and those held by teachers. No racial difference existed in students' assessment of their teachers' ability to help students attain their goals. With respect to teachers' desire to help, however, an important difference existed: "... Lower socioeconomic youth and especially Negro youth are least likely to preceive the teacher as someone with a desire to facilitate goal attainment."[2] Gottlieb speculated: "It seems quite likely that Negro students are more apt to see Negro as opposed to white teachers as understanding their goals and as having a desire to help the student attain goals."[3] In segregated classrooms Negro students may find it easier to discuss Negro problems, much less so than in interracial classrooms.

Gottlieb draws a sharp distinction between an integrated and a merely interracial school. In the former, children of all backgrounds are represented through the social system of the school. In the latter, children of different backgrounds coexist. In interracial schools, according to the findings of Project Talent, Negro youth do achieve at higher levels than do Negro youth in segregated schools. On the other hand, the same data reveal that "incidents of school dropout, absenteeism, and delinquency are less likely... to occur in all-Negro schools within the South."[4] While Gottlieb concludes that segregated schools are inferior to genuinely integrated schools, he also holds that in some respects the southern segregated school is inferior to the merely interracial school.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 12
[2] Ibid., p. 13.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid., p. 16.

Brown studied aspiration in rural central Florida.[1] Forty-one matched pairs of Negro and white sixth grade students were the subjects. Negro children had significantly higher vocational aspirations. While the children as a whole aspired to higher occupations than those held by their fathers, this was true of Negro children to a much greater degree.

Aspirations among Negro and white boys in the Boston area were studied by Meeks.[2] He compared the following groups:

Group A	20 lower-class Negro boys from Roxbury
B	18 lower-middle class white boys from South Boston
C	18 middle class Negro boys from Roxbury
D	20 middle class white boys from upper-middle class private schools in Boston area.

Aspiration levels were ascertained by student performance on an experimental mechanical testing device. Meeks had expected to find lower class boys with higher aspirations; the reverse turned out to be the case. He predicted Negro boys would have lower aspirations than whites; in fact, he found there was no significant difference. On the other hand, he found--as he had predicted--that "lower class Negroes will have aspirations which are significantly lower than any other race-class combination."[1] He also predicted with success that "lower-class Negro subjects will have significantly lower aspirations with Negro experimenters than with white experimenters...."[2]

---

[1] Robert G. Brown, "A Comparison of the Vocational Aspirations of Paired Sixth-Grade White and Negro Children Who Attend Segregated Schools," Journal of Educational Research, May-June, 1965.

[2] Donald E. Meeks, Race, Social Class, and Level of Aspiration: The Effects of Race and Social Class on the Goal-Striving Behavior of White and Negro Boys (Doctoral dissertation, Smith College, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-907).

In a real sense, Meeks' study does not belong here as it is not placed in an actual school setting; it is designed as a typical psychological laboratory experiment. On the other hand, its conclusions are, for the most part, sharply at variance with virtually all others in one finding: Meeks fails to find Negro aspirations higher than white aspirations. Unfortunately, the research report contains no acknowledgment of the exceptional nature of this finding. The controls over social class were not very strong in this study, thus highlighting the role of class. In addition, Meeks' theoretical orientation is psychoanalytical. This leads him to conceive of the lower-class Negro as an objectively defeated person who is unable to make the standards of the society's ego ideal--i.e., the white man--his own. The lower class Negro is thus regarded as a man without a father. "The defeated attitude with which they /lower class Negroes/ approach goal-setting is a result of the ego's yielding to environmental realties and repressing the standards of the ego ideal. They fantasy 'rescue' by neither the socially impotent real father nor the abstract, hostile white model."[3] This explanation suffers from one central failing: It is contradicted by most consequential studies in the field.

Sain studied vocational aspirations among 258 students in a Detroit ghetto school.[4] Occupational preferences and the expectations for the 130 boys were as follows, by percentage:[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 56.

[2] Ibid., p. 58.

[3] Ibid., p. 94.

[4] Leonard F. Sain, Occupational Preferences and Expectations of Negro Students Attending a High School Located in a Lower Socio-Economic Area (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-10, 119).

	Preference	Expectation
Engineer	23.8	17.7
Physician	9.2	6.2
Teacher	6.9	6.2

The scholastic average of the students in this school can be judged from the scores on a standard achievement test battery taken by 317 students in grade 10B. On vocabulary, the mean score was more than two years below grade level, and for reading comprehension only a little less than two years. Sain adds that "many students scored on approximately a 4.0 to 5.9 grade level in certain sections of the test."[2]

Odell directed a large-scale survey of the Philadelphia public schools.[3] One part of the report traced the city's 1961 high school graduates and enabled a check to be made upon the high educational aspirations of lower-ranked Negro students. Here is a compilation by percent showing Negro and white boys who graduated in 1961, and where they went after graduation:[4]

I. Q. Level Group	Went to College	Other School	Armed Forces
White boys			
3rd quarter	13	7	16
4th quarter	3	3	6
Negro boys			
3rd quarter	32	0	28
4th quarter	8	5	23

---

1. Ibid., p. 112.
2. Ibid., footnote 2, p. 172.
3. William R. Odell, Educational Survey Report for the Philadelphia Board of Public Education. Philadelphia: Board of Public Education, February 1, 1965.
4. Ibid., p. 169.

According to the table, forty of every 200 Negro graduates in the lower half of the class, by I. Q. level, actually entered college; the corresponding figure for white with equivalent I. Q. scores was sixteen. This would indicate a greater realism behind high aspirations than might appear at first glance.

St. John studied the relationship of segregation and aspirations.[1] She hypothesized that "the greater the average percent Negro of schools attended in elementary grades one through nine, the lower the educational aspirations of Negro high school students."[2] The hypothesis, however, was not supported by the findings.

Goldberg and Cowan probed certain fantasy behavior related to the achievement role of the Negro male.[3] Negro college girls who were matriarchically oriented, nevertheless were able to conceive of the Negro male as a potential achiever. This view was expressed in the course of the TAT projective tests. "...Although the Negro male may be culturally devaluated," observe the researchers, "in fantasy he is seen as striving toward achievement related goals."[4] Perhaps, they conclude, this indicates a changing conception of the role of the Negro male.

Cramer, Bowerman, and Campbell studied educational aspirations of southern Negro high school students.[5] Their sample covered Alabama, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Virginia. Over 10,000 Negro adolescents completed questionnaires, including follow-up studies; the period covered was November, 1963-January, 1965. None of the students, apparently, was enrolled in a meaningfully desegregated school. As Wilson had found in Berkeley, so the Cramer group also reported: "... Those with low socioeconomic status may definitely benefit from being in a school environment where college-going is more or less the normal expectation."[1] This was true of the Negro students as well as a white control group.

---

[1] Nancy Hoyt St. John, "The Effect of Segregation on the Aspirations of Negro Youth," Harvard Educational Review, Summer, 1966.

[2] Ibid., p. 286.

[3] Faye J. Goldberg and Gloria Cowan, "Achievement Motivation and Fantasy Production as a Function of the Race and Sex of the TAT Figures," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans, March 31, 1966.

[4] Ibid., p. 6.

[5] M. Richard Cramer, Charles E. Bowerman and Ernest Q. Campbell, Social Factors in Educational Achievement and Aspirations Among Negro Adolescents, 2 vols. (Chapel Hill: Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, 1966.)

Huson and Schlitz examined the vocational records of Negro college graduates from Louisiana.[2] Negro students came from Dillard, Grambling, Southern, and Xavier universities. White control students were from Louisiana Polytechnical Institute, Northwestern State, and Tulane University. The major findings of the study were:[3]

1. Negroes are unemployed for longer.
2. Negroes start at lower salaries.
3. Negroes are further behind whites in salary after fifteen months of work than they were to begin with.
4. All but a few Negroes work in substantially Negro environments.

More than half the male Negro graduates became teachers, an occupation to which the above-named findings applied with the greatest force.

Fichter conducted three studies of a national sample of Negro college graduates.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., II, p. 350.

[2] Carolyn F. Huson and Michael E. Schiltz, College, Color, and Employment. Racial Differences in Postgraduate Employment Among 1964 Graduates of Louisiana Colleges (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, July, 1966).

[3] Ibid., p. XIX.

"Lower income Negroes," according to Fichter, "demonstrate an amazing tenacity in striving for schooling...."[2] Although they had associated very little with college-oriented people before coming to college, Negro students nontheless seemed to have an especially strong determination to get through college. Compared with white graduates, "the Negroes plan earlier, decide sooner, and are more strongly committed to their career choice."[3] Most enter the field of education. Extremely few prepare for business careers which they regard as the single most racially restricted field.[4]

Fichter, observing a certain self-confidence among the graduates of southern colleges, explained their mood this way:

> This Negro college graduate personally knows large numbers of Negroes who 'didn't make it,' perhaps he has close relatives who were 'left behind' in the struggle for higher education. There is a shorter intergenerational distance between the father who did not finish grade school and who is a laborer, and the son who finishes

---

[1] Joseph H. Fichter: Young Negro Talent--Survey of the Experiences and Expectations of Negro Americans Who Graduated from College in 1961 (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, November, 1964): Negro Women Bachelors. A Comparative Exploration of the Expectations and Experiences of College Graduates of the Class of June, 1961 (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, January, 1965: and Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges, Class of 1964 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967).

[2] Fichter, Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges, p. 52.

[3] Ibid., p. 154.

[4] Fichter, Young Negro Talent, pp.37 and 54. See also, Andrew F. Brimmer, "Employment Patterns and the Dilemma of Desegregation," Integrated Education, October-November, 1967, and "Education and the Economic Advancement of Minority Groups." Integrated Education, March-April, 1970.

> college to be a professional. More so than the white student, therefore, he has a feeling of accomplishment and of confidence in his own proved ability. The fact is that he has overcome odds, he has fought through successfully, and his self-image may not be quite so unrealistic as it first appears to be.[1]

Another facet of this activist and expansive orientation in the same Negro college student's participation in civil rights activities. Fichter found that Negro college students were seven times likelier to participate in campus civil rights activities than were whites.[2]

Krystall, Chesler, and White made an intensive public opinion study of the Negro community in Montgomery, Alabama.[3] During June, July and November, 1966, interviewers probed attitudes related to desegregation. The researchers found that "approximately sixty-eight percent of the parents felt that the least amount of education their children needed was a college degree. Almost all parents felt sure their children would get it."[4] Only one out of five parents, however, had seriously considered sending their child to an all-white school.[5] At the same time, seven out of ten approved of the principle of Negro and white attending the same schools.[6]

---

1. Fichter, Young Negro Talent, p. 62.

2. Fichter, Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges, p. 211.

3. Eric R. Krystall, Mark A. Chesler, and Agatha E. White, Voting Behavior and Attitudes Toward School Desegregation: A Study of Southern Negroes (Tuskegee, Alabama: Department of Social Science Research, Tuskegee Institute, March, 1967).

4. Ibid., p. 29.

5. Ibid., p. 34.

6. Ibid., p. 38.

Smith and colleagues explored various aspects of integration in the Detroit area.[1] Samples of Negro and white parents in Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb counties were tested on aspirations for their children. Here is how they responded:[2]

Occupational Field	White	Negro
Professional, technical and kindred	72%	67%
Other white collar	12	13
Skilled blue collar	6	5
Unskilled blue collar	1	2
Miscellaneous	6	11
Don't know and not available	3	2
N=	383	92

Researchers then ascertained parental perceptions of their children's chances of attaining white collar or blue collar occupations:[3]

	Negro		White	
Achievement Likelihood	White Collar	Blue Collar	White Collar	Blue Collar
Very good	47%	46%	62%	47%
Fairly good	53	41	28	40
Not so good	0	5	3	6
Poor	0	1	0	1
Other	0	7	7	6
N=	15	76	156	224

---

[1] Ralph V. Smith, Stanley E. Flory, Rashid L. Bashshur, and Gary W. Shannon, Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area: An Ecological Analysis (Ypsilanti, Michigan: Eastern Michigan University, September 8, 1967).

[2] Ibid., p. 50.

[3] Ibid., p. 51.

Smith and his colleagues explain that these rather high aspirations are expected by Negro parents to materialize through an effective school system. Indeed, Negroes expressed very high support for the schools, exceeding by far support expressed by various groups of white adults.[1]

A series of recent studies concern aspiration among Negro children in elementary schools.

The Franks study of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, discussed earlier, found no significant aspirational differences between successful and unsuccessful Negro learners in sixth grade.[2] Alam studied Negro and white youth in three rural East Central Texas counties. Negro youth felt they would meet with less economic opportunity but did not as a consequence lower their occupational expectations.[3] Proportionately, Negroes were overrepresented at both the high and low ends of the scale of occupations chosen. "For both races," noted Alam, "no significant relationship was obtained between their perception of opportunity and occupations they expect to attain."[4] Rodman and Voydanoff, studying 255 Negro children in a Detroit, Michigan, preschool and kindergarten, found parents' aspirations for their children fell into an extremely wide range. The range was wider for lower class parents than for middle class parents; indeed, the higher the social class, the narrower the span of aspirations. The researchers advise that to promote social mobility, these parents must become convinced of the practicality of aspirations, it is not necessary to convince them of the desirability of high aspirations for their children.[1]

---

[1] On specific school policies, however, considerable controversy exists. See, for example, National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, Detroit, Michigan. A Study of Barriers to Equal Educational Opportunity in a Large City (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, March, 1967) and Karl D. Gregory, "The Walkout: Symptom of Dying Inner City Schools," New University Thought, Spring, 1967.

[2] Franks, Some Social Determinants of Academic Success Among Culturally Disadvantaged Negro Children, p. 53.

[3] Bilquis A. Alam, Perception of Opportunity and Occupational Expectations: A Racial Comparison of Rural Youth, April, 1968 (ERIC # ED 021 663).

[4] Ibid., p. 9.

Veroff and Peele at the University of Michigan studied some of the consequences of closing a predominantly Negro elementary school and the transfer of its students to six receiving schools. Then children were compared with a similar group who attended a predominantly Negro school. After a year of desegregation, the transferred Negro children had acquired "consistently higher autonomous achievement motivation scores" than Negro boys in the non-transferred group.[2] Desegregation seemed to have moderated the "unrealistically high aspirations of the Negro boys...."[3] while at the same time having given rise to a greater self-confidence. The researchers declare:

> ... To guard against defensive overaspiration in children a desegregation program has to juggle two paradoxical factors. It first must avoid placing Negro or white children in positions in schools that make them feel a salient "minority" status. It must also provide contact with children whose background represents a higher status than their own. All of this suggests the desirability of a school desegregation program that promotes a thorough intermixing of children of different races and social classes.[4]

---

[1] Hyman Rodman and Patricia Voydanoff, Social Class and Parents' Aspirations for Their Children, August, 1968, p. 11 (ERIC # ED 030 482).

[2] Joseph Veroff and Stanton Peele, "Initial Effects of Desegregation on the Achievement Motivation of Negro Elementary School Children," Journal of Social Issues, 25 (1969), 82-93.

[3] Ibid., p. 87.

[4] Ibid., pp. 89-90.

A point of considerable practical import is made by Henderson. He stresses that the need of lower class Negro boys for enhanced self-concept is separate from their need to come to know a broad range of occupations. Often, successful Negro practitioners are invited to speak to classrooms of Negro youth. Henderson observes that while such events may bolster youthful self-concepts, they will also limit the range of occupations for students to consider. As Henderson explains: "... Lower class white students with middle class white role models will be exposed to considerably *more* occupational alternatives than will lower class Negro students with middle class Negro role models."[1]

On the junior high and high school level, a larger series of studies has been done in recent years.

Wylie and Hutchins studied samples of Negro and white junior high and high school students in Illinois and Pennsylvania. Over a six year period it was found that more Negroes than whites wished to attend college and were convinced they were able to do so.[2] More of them also report being encouraged by their parents. In Pinellas County, Clearwater, Florida, Carwise found that students at this all-Negro school had very high educational aspirations. Achievement was more closely related to the students' own attitudes towards further education than with those of parents.[3]

Durig explored the possible interrelations of occu-

---

1. George Henderson, "Role Models for Lower Class Negro Boys," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 46 (1967-68) 7 (emphasis in original).

2. Ruth C. Wylie and Edwin B. Hutchins, "Schoolwork-Ability Estimates and Aspirations as a Function of Socio-economic Level, Race, and Sex," *Psychological Reports*, 21 (1967) 799.

3. Joseph L. Carwise, *Aspirations and Attitudes Toward Educations of Over- and Under-Achieving Negro Junior High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-4711).

pational choice and social class background or neighborhood. He studied Negro and white students in three Indianapolis, Indiana high schools. He found that occupational aspirations of white boys were related not to neighborhood but to the prestige level of their fathers' occupation. For Negro boys, however, aspirations exceeded the prestige level of fathers' occupations. Why was this so? Durig speculated that the reason lay with the integration of the school and the neighborhood in which the sample Negroes studied and resided. Referring to the Negro students, Durig explained: "In their striving toward emancipation they compare themselves with members of the dominant group. This comparison might motivate them to emulate the occupational aspirations as well as the values of the dominant group. This motivation is undoubtedly increased among Negroes in an integrated neighborhood."[1] (It should be noted that most of the white students in the integrated school came from white collar families.)

Thorpe studied aspirations for a professional or technical occupation among high school students in five North Carolina cities.[2] Race per se was found to be of minor importance. With social class controlled, for example, white and Negro boys had identical aspirational levels.[3] Boys of higher social class in both races were better informed about required formal training for professional and technical occupations.

---

[1] Kurt Robert Durig, A Study of Social Status and Occupational Choice Among High School Students (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1967), p. 95. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-2283).

[2] These were Asheville, Charlotte, Fayetteville, Salisbury, and Shelby.

[3] Claiburne Burnice Thorpe, Status, Race, and Aspiration. A Study of the Desire of High School Students to Enter a Professional or a Technical Occupation (Doctoral dissertation, New School for Social Research, 1968), p.40. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-17, 870).

Negro girls, Thorpe found, were the most ambitious of all. These higher strivings were based on fact rather than fantasy.[1]

> Although the matriarchal pattern of Negro family structure appears to be rooted in slavery, its perpetuation may rest in education.... The 1960 Census revealed that for all white persons 25 years of age and over who had completed four or more years of college, 39 percent were women. For Negroes, the figure was 53 percent.

Thus, considerably more than idle aspiration lies behind the high strivings of Negro girls in this study.

Caplin studied self-concept and aspiration of fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students in three schools in a small northern New Jersey city in the New York City metropolitan area.[2] He compared white and Negro children in a de facto segregated school, a newly-desegregated one, and one that had been desegregated for a long time. Both white and Negro children had significantly higher aspirations in the newly desegregated school than in the de facto segregated schools. Caplin warns that "the school must take positive action to protect and enhance this initial gain."[3] Unfortunately, the research did not establish levels of aspiration of children prior to their entry into the newly-desegregated school. Consequently, it is altogether possible that the superiority of these children on aspiration antedated desegregation.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 72.

[2] Morris Daniel Caplin, The Relationship Between Self Concept and Academic Achievement and Between Level of Aspiration and Academic Achievement (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-10, 284); same author, "Self-Concept, Level of Aspiration, and Academic Achievement," Journal of Negro Education, Fall, 1968.

[3] Caplin, The Relationship Between Self-Concept and Academic Achievement, p. 68.

Rhodes examined the effect of a mother's aspiration for her child upon the child's own aspiration for higher education. He found it to be the single most important factor and not equalled by peer group influence. School climate was regarded as distinctly secondary in effect. Low aspirations by Negro mothers tend to be countervailed in their effect by high aspirations of friends. While Negroes are less likely than whites to be enrolled in college preparatory curricula--the percentages are forty-one and sixteen--if mother and child have high aspirations for college the percentages change to sixty and thirty-two.[1] "Negroes," Rhodes concludes, "were less likely to be enrolled in a college preparatory curriculum. Therefore, any program to increase Negro attendance at college should include counseling or direction in the early years of the secondary school experience."[2] In a supplementary study to that of Rhodes, Mommsen declared that while Negroes did not regard education as the only means of leaving the ghetto, this high valuation of education is part of the Black American subculture."[3] A study by Allen and Robinson in Logan County, Oklahoma attests to the fact that high Negro maternal aspirations for children are not universal. Comparing aspirations of Negro mothers on AFDC or other welfare programs with those of non-welfare mothers, the Langston University researchers reported: "Both groups manifest a low degree of both interest and influence in their children's vocational aspirations.... Many mothers gave neutral responses on job aspirations such as 'I would like any job but just so it is a good job.'"[4]

---

[1] Albert Lewis Rhodes, Effects of Parental Expectations on Educational Plans of White and Nonwhite Adolescents, September, 1968, pp. 151, 155. (ERIC # ED 027 096).

[2] Ibid., p. 10.

[3] Kent G. Mommsen, "Valuation of Alternative Success Means by Race, Sex, Ability and Socioeconomic Status," Appendix C in Rhodes, p. C14.

[4] Donald E. Allen and Oliver W. Robinson, Some Factors Affecting Academic Performance of Public Assistance Students, 1969, p. 27 (ERIC # ED 029 747).

In Dade County, Florida, Curtis studied vocational aspirations of Negro students in segregated and desegregated schools. Students had attended the desegregated schools for two to three years. They tended to state they were preparing for professional, technical, managerial, clerical, and sales careers. Students in the segregated school tended to select service occupations, machine trades, bench work, and structural work.[1] Curtis felt that many poorly prepared students who selected highly specialized careers were "choosing these jobs in an effort to improve their self-esteem."[2]

Gurin and associates made two studies of motivation among Negro college students. In the first study, it was found that elementary or high school teaching was the career choice of twenty-four percent of the males and forty-four percent of the females. This, as we saw in Fichter's earlier studies, was a traditional career choice for southern Negroes especially. Whether a nontraditional career choice will be made depends in part upon the person's world-outlook. Gurin and Katz cited an example: "The males who have high self-confidence about academic success and strong beliefs that they, rather than the exigencies of fate, can control what happens in their own lives also aspire to more prestigeful, demanding, and nontraditional occupations than do males with lower generalized expectancies of success."[3]

But Negro students learn to take the overarching fact of racial discrimination into account in their career calculations. Clearly, to acknowledge the importance of discrimination is to recognize a factor beyond one's control. Attention to discrimination, emphasize the researchers, "may not imply a sense of powerlessness but rather an enhanced capacity to cope that comes from being more reality-oriented about both the obstacles and opportunities for a Negro in this society."[1]

---

[1] Byron William Curtis, The Effects of Segregation on the Vocational Aspirations of Negro Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1968), pp. 71-72. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 605).

[2] Ibid., p. 77.

[3] Patricia Gurin and Daniel Katz, Motiviation and Aspiration in the Negro College, November, 1966, p. 143. (ERIC # ED 010 537).

Socioeconomic status as such tells us little about these students' aspirations. Grouping all students from lower status homes, for example, produces no meaningful pattern. Separating high-ability from low-ability students in such a background, however, reveals a stark contrast: aspirations of the latter are "severely depressed."[2]

These same high ability students are not as heavily penalized by the absence in their homes of "high aspirant models" inasmuch as teachers and other models had proved adequate substitutes.[3]

In a second study, Gurin and associates analyzed the interrelationships between motivation and what is known as "internal-external control." This concept describes either those who accept a personal responsibility for events, rather than blaming or thanking others ("internal"); or those who tend to see external events and/or forces as the initiators of action affecting them, and who tend therefore to place the blame or credit on others ("external"). In a middle class model, internal orientation is usually considered normal or even healthy, while external orientation is regarded as dysfunctional for academic achievement.

This distinction, contend the researchers, cloaks more than it reveals when applied to Negro students. A strictly internal orientation would lead a Negro student to accept personal blame for many learning problems directly attributable to socially-imposed patterns of racial discrimination. In the Gurin-D. Katz study, Negro students of high ability who had an internal orientation were the same ones who tended to select jobs less traditional for Negroes. At the same time, they acknowledged the presence of discrimination as a limiting factor upon their aspirations. Gurin and associates in their

---

1. Ibid., p. 175.
2. Ibid., p. 209.
3. Ibid., p. 220.

study distinguish between personal and collective aspirations. The former stresses individual advancement by single Negroes; the latter, advancement by Negroes as a whole. Personal control and racial militancy, they found, were negatively related.[1] This did not necessarily mean that racial militants desired to overthrow the existing system but rather that they wished "to remove the barriers to Negro mobility within the system...."[2] Thus, high Negro aspirations tend to operate within a collective framework (and are "external") but tend to facilitate individual mobility (and are also "internal").

II. SELF-CONCEPT OF NEGRO STUDENTS

"Other things being equal," wrote Du Bois in 1935, "the mixed school is the broader, more natural basis for the education of all youth. It gives wider contacts; it inspires greater self-confidence; and suppresses the inferiority complex."[3] Today, we might say more simply that in the integrated school, children develop sounder self-concept. What has research shown?

Weddington studied various aspects of racial and class stereotypes among young children.[4] She selected 374 Negro and white children attending three schools in Gary, Indiana. (In 1948, when the children were tested, school segregation was legal in Indiana.) One school was all-Negro, another was all-white, and a third was white but located near a Negro area. Most significant was the researcher's effort to treat class and color as independent contributors to stereotyping. She found, for example, that Negro children assigned favorable traits to whites more frequently than they assigned the same traits to themselves. Usually, this finding was interpreted to signify the self-devaluation of the Negro child. Weddington, however, discovered that this practice was "more a function of the insidious influence of latent class designation than of skin color...."[1] Indeed, color-bias was more evident on the part of the white children. All in all, favorable stereotypes tended to be assigned to persons of high social status--both Negro and white--while unfavorable stereotypes were assigned--interracially--to persons of lower class status.

---

[1] Patricia Gurin, Gerald Gurin, Rosina C. Lao, and Muriel Beattie, "Internal-External Control in the Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth," Journal of Social Issues, 25 (1969) 53.

[2] Ibid., p. 51.

[3] W. E. B. Du Bois, "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" Journal of Negro Education, July, 1935, p. 335.

[4] Rachel T. Weddington, The Relative Influence of Social Class and Color on the Stereotypes of Young Children (Doctoral dissertation, Committee on Human Development, University of Chicago, 1948).

Trent studied self-acceptance and interracial attitudes.[2] His sample consisted of 202 Negro children, ages 9 to 18, in New York City. He found that "children who were most self-accepting expressed significantly more positive attitudes toward both Negroes and whites than did children who were _least_ self-accepting."[3] No indication was given of the degree of school segregation of the children involved.

Claye made an early study of the effect of desegregation on self-concept in three Arkansas schools. While he designated two schools as segregated and another as integrated, he gave no data as to the cities in which they were located nor the color composition of the non-segregated school. His findings did not support his expectation that the desegregated white students would show a positive growth in self-concept and that they would develop more positive attitudes towards Negroes. Claye noted that the political atmosphere was most unfavorable for measuring interracial attitudes inasmuch as the Little Rock school crisis occurred at that time.

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 54.

[2] Richard D. Trent, "The Relation Between Expressed Self-Acceptance and Expressed Attitudes Toward Negroes and Whites Among Negro Children," _Journal of Genetic Psychology_, September, 1957.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 30.

It may be recalled that both Blake and Geisel, whose work was reviewed above, also discussed the matter of Negro self-esteem. Blake had speculated that "the struggle to maintain self-esteem is much more difficult for Negro students in segregated schools than in integrated schools."[1] Geisel reported that his data contained no evidence that Negroes scored lower on self-concept.[2] Indeed, "Negro mean scores are significantly higher than whites on the evaluative factor of self."[3] And in a striking formulation, Geisel declares: "Who are the Negroes with high self-concept scores? They are aggressive, race conscious, high achievers who epitomize the expression 'Negroes are as good as anyone else.'"[4]

Haggstrom studied self-esteem and desegregation in Detroit and Ypsilanti.[5] His sample consisted of a total of 120 Negro households in both cities. By self-esteem, he

---

[1] Blake, A Comparison of Intraracial and Interracial Levels of Aspiration, p. 69.

[2] Geisel, I.Q. Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southern City, p. 91.

[3] Ibid., p. 277.

[4] Ibid., p. 282.

[5] Warren C. Haggstrom, Self-Esteem and Other Characteristics of Residentially Desegregated Negroes (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962) (University Microfilms Order No. 63-359) also, Haggstrom, "Segregation, Desegregation, and Negro Personality," Integrated Education, October-November, 1963.

3

meant "self-perception of the degree to which the basic values and aspirations are realized."[1] His central finding was that desegregated Negroes have higher self-esteem than do segregated Negroes. Haggstrom tentatively concluded that this was so "because the Negro community as a symbol of inferiority depresses the self-esteem of its members."[2] The Negro community, according to Haggstrom, is a white-created symbol of "permanent social inferiority"flying in the face of a social value of equality. In the ghetto, exaggerated perceptions of whites develop, and persistent social failure there leads to further identification of Negro /of self/ with failure.

Desegregated Negroes are more rejecting of the color line and more accepting of both white and Negro people. Segregated Negroes, on the other hand, tend to live within the color line and are less accepting of whites. Haggstrom found that "desegregated families more often and to a greater extent help children consciously work through problems of their feelings about racial differences."[3] In segregated milieux, racial "incidents" are, by definition, rare, and thus seldom become a topic of conversation. In interracial neighborhoods, however, it is common for desegregated Negro parents "to help their young children accept the difference in skin color and understand that they need not feel less worthy because of it. The greater number of incidents in white neighborhoods serve as occasions which lead parents explicitly to express love and esteem to their children as Negro children."[4] Desegregated Negro children are thus doubly the beneficiaries of desegregation: their parents have greater self-esteem and they themselves are more accepted for what they are and thus have a broader basis for their own self-esteem.

Haggstrom closes with a frankly speculative comment:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 84.
[2] Ibid., p. 160.
[3] Ibid., p. 157.
[4] Ibid., p. 158. (emphasis in original).

"My guess is that Negroes of high achievement in adult life tend disproportionately either to have had desegregated childhoods or to have been children in households the adult members of which have been desegregated during childhood."[1]

Stinson studied the effect of desegregation upon basic intergroup attitudes.[2] A sample of 833 Negro and white students in 13 schools located in a large southern city was tested in September, 1962, and February, 1963. His findings: "Positive perceptions of others' self-acceptance increased for the desegregated group while perceptions of the segregated group on the same variable decreased. There was greater similarity in the perceptions of Negro and white students than in the perceptions of segregated and desegregated students."[3] Virtually no indication is given of what concrete classroom experience might have produced these results.

Maliver explored anti-Negro bias among Negro college students.[4] He predicted that low-scorers--i. e., with little such bias--would tend to identify more positively with their parents and themselves, and would tend to resist actively any attack upon themselves. All hypotheses had to be rejected in view of the findings. As Maliver concluded: "It is difficult to draw theoretical implications since the major hypotheses of the study were rejected."[5]

Derbyshire studied personal identity among Negro students at Morgan State College in Baltimore.[1] He found a pervasive sense of identity conflict among the subjects, especially as concerned color. Those students most secure in their identity as Negroes were also most likely to accept other minorities.[2] Students who were unsure of their identity as Negroes tended to define their relation to others in negativistic terms: We are not sure of anything but that we don't want to be like you. Students who were more certain of their identity tended to define the Negro role in terms of sharing certain humanistic goals.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 172.

[2] Harold N. Stinson, The Effect of Desegregation on the Adjustment and Values of Negro and White Students (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1963) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-5089).

[3] Ibid., p. 79.

[4] Bruce L. Maliver, Anti-Negro Bias Among Negro College Students, (Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1964) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-10, 006)

[5] Ibid., p. 121.

Baehr studied the relation of "southern" dialect to need achievement among students in Crane High School, a virtually all-Negro school in Chicago.[3] He found that boys with the greatest need to achieve tended to minimize southern dialect in those situations approximating competitive relations in the larger society. They did not, however, suppress or moderate the dialect in other situations. These findings are reported in this section because they indicate that a Negro can change certain aspects of his "Negro-ness" with no apparent injury to his self-concept. In the Dumbarton study of Oakland, California, discussed earlier, it was observed that there was no significant difference between the self-concept of segregated and desegregated Negro students.[4]

Meketon studied the impact of desegregation upon the self-esteem of Negro children.[1] Eighty-nine fifth and sixth grade Negro students were located in three schools, as follows:

---

[1] Robert L. Derbyshire, Personal Identity: An Attitude Study of American Negro College Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1964) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-11, 098).

[2] Ibid., p. 259.

[3] Rufus F. Baehr, Need Achievement and Dialect in Lower-Class Adolescent Negroes (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964). See, also, Baehr, " 'Negro Dialect' and the Motive to Achieve, " Integrated Education, February-March, 1966.

[4] Race and Education in the City of Oakland, p. 141.

School	Total Enrollment	% Negro	Number of Negroes in Sample	Location
School A	821	100	29	Norwich
School B	416	30	29	Norwich
School C	586	22	31	Burwyn

Students were matched comprehensively; a control group for children in School A was also matched. It is important to note that schools B and C had desegregated under very different circumstances. In B, desegregation had taken place on administrative initiative; no demonstrations or public pressure had come from the organized Negro community. In C, however, desegregation had come as a direct consequence of prolonged and bitter public controversy, involving debates and demonstrations by the Negro community. School A, of course, was still segregated, as shown above.

Two principal hypotheses were entertained:[2]

1. The Negro child's performance will be adversely affected by the process of school integration....

2. ... Forced competition with a group considered to be "superior" will affect the child's feelings of self-esteem in a negative fashion.

The findings contradicted both hypotheses. The predicted significant differences did not appear in the data. Various other hypotheses and sub-hypotheses fared differently.

As between School A and School B, children at the former--segregated--school scored significantly higher on the Self Subtest, a partial test of self-esteem. On the other hand, Negro children at the peacefully desegregated School B did not have significantly higher self-esteem scores than children at the tumultuously desegregated school C. Indeed, children at the latter school had significantly higher self-esteem scores than children at School A. Teachers at all three schools were asked to make certain judgments about the children: "... School C teachers evaluated their students as possessing higher levels of self-esteem than did either of the other two schools, and in Schools A and B, teachers found more evidence of defensive behavior than did teachers in School C."[1]

---

[1] Betty F. Meketon, The Effects of Integration Upon the Negro Child's Responses to Various Tasks and Upon His Level of Self-Esteem (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1966).

[2] Ibid., pp. 1-2.

Why did Negro students at School C hold up so well? Meketon suggests that the explanation lies with the salience of family and home for these particular children. Among the factors contributing to the high morale of School C children were:[2]

> The support and sympathy of a close-knit Negro community, national encouragement represented by legal counsel from NAACP, and Supreme Court decisions. Negro community morale, together with the obvious fact that integration had been accomplished to a large extent on their own /parents'/ terms, must have served as a source of encouragement to the children. Victories for Negroes in their exchanges with whites are infrequent.

Several Negro teachers worked in School C and they proved a valued refuge for the desegregated Negro children. In School B, on the other hand, the entire community support aspect was absent. Also, not a single Negro teacher worked in School B.

Student anxiety, which Meketon had originally thought would undo the desegregated child, did not have this con-

---

1. Ibid., pp. 67-68.
2. Ibid., p. 79.

sequence: "The child," observed Meketon, "is remarkably adaptable and flexible, and given the right circumstances can overcome many of the detrimental aspects of integration."[1] Parental support, she adds, is crucial: "Parental understanding and consideration when the child fails scholastically in his competition with his white peers or meets with rebuffs will help counteract the child's feelings of guilt and inferiority."[2]

The Meketon study is a surprisingly close affirmation of the work of clinician Robert Coles.[3]

In studying Negro and white students in integrated junior high schools and predominantly white high schools, Wylie and Hutchins concluded that "all things considered... there is no support for the commonly assumed hypothesis that Negroes' expressed self-estimates are lower than whites' ....[4] McWhirt, of the University of South Carolina, found in a southern city that a school year of desegregation increased self-concept of Negro girls and white boys.[5] Miller examined two groups of Negro students, one attending a virtually all-Negro school, the other, a school in which Negroes were about twenty percent of enrollment. Both schools were in suburbs of Detroit, Michigan. The students were not succeeding. Yet, holds Miller, they seemed "to possess the types of student attitude necessary for academic

---

1. _Ibid._, p. 90.
2. _Ibid._, p. 91.
3. See Robert Coles, Children of Crisis: _A Study of Courage and Fear_ (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967), _passim_.
4. Wylie and Hutchins, "Schoolwork-Ability Estimates and Aspirations as a Function of Socioeconomic Level, Race, and Sex," pp. 798-799.
5. Ronald Alfred McWhirt, _The Effects of Desegregation on Prejudice, Academic Aspiration, and the Self-Concept of Tenth Grade Students_ (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1967), p. 29. (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15, 568).

motivation: interest in education, high self-concept, and a sense of control of academic environment."[1] The major responsibility for lack of achievement, declares Miller, rests with "the institution and the negative attitudes of those who represent it."[2]

Harootunian and Morse studied self-concept among Negro students in Kent County, Delaware. Compared were an all-Negro school and a formerly white one recently desegregated by the free-choice method. Negroes in the desegregated school had higher self-concept scores and sense of fate-control than did Negroes in the segregated school.[3] The researchers criticized the freedom-of-choice technique of desegregation:[4]

> On the one hand Negro students are placed in a position of asking for something that is rightfully theirs; on the other, the departure of the most able and strongest personalities tends to isolate even further those who do not desegregate. The empirical evidence from our study impresses us with the folly of any kind of partial or quasi solution to the problem of school desegregation.

One possible drawback of this study is that the researchers were unable to tell whether the desegregation plan selected students of high self-concept or whether the desegregation experience engendered higher self-concept.[5]

---

1. Ibid., p. 121.
2. Ibid., p. 124.
3. Berj Harootunian and Richard J. Morse, Characteristics of Negro and White High School Students Prior to Desegregation. A Study of Negro Student's Freedom of Choice, September, 1968, pp.82 and 107. (ERIC # ED 024 745.)
4. Ibid., p. 108.
5. See also Berj Harootunian, Self-Other Relationships of Segregated and Desegregated Ninth Graders, February 8, 1968. (ERIC # ED 023 765)

In Florida, Negro students who desegregated a high school experienced a drop in self-concept as compared with Negro students who remained in the segregated school. Several special factors may have operated to help bring about this unusual feature of a desegregated situation. A great deal of conflict continued between Negro and white students with non-acceptance of the Negro the rule. The whole integration experience in the community was "an anxiety-producing phenomenon." Academically, the Negro students are having a very difficult time of it. A number of the subjects were militants whose first interest was trail-blazing. The researcher reported that guidance counselors reported that in the second year the entrants were students "who performed on a higher academic level and whose incentive to integrate was to avail themselves of better educational opportunities."[1]

Lessing studied certain aspects of ego-functioning of Negro and white eighth and eleventh graders in three suburbs of Chicago; the schools were integrated. She sought possible implications for academic achievement. In the first phase of the study it appeared that Negro children were significantly less willing to delay immediate gratification and were thus less able to study and learn. When, however, Lessing controlled the effects of I.Q; this apparent racial difference in gratification-delay disappeared.[2] (She believes the Coleman Report overestimated the achievement-effect of fate-control for Negro students for the same reason: I.Q. was not controlled.[3]) It is intelligence, rather

---

1. Millard J. Bienvenu, Sr., Effects of School Integration on the Self-Concept and Anxiety of Lower-Class, Negro Adolescent Males (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1968), p. 52. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 671).

2. Elsie E. Lessing, "Racial Differences in Indices of Ego Functioning Relevant to Academic Achievement," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 115 (1969), 161-162.

4. Ibid., p. 163.

than fate-control or gratification-delay that is the principal avenue to academic achievement. For this reason, Lessing concludes, remedial programs must have a cognitive focus rather than one aimed primarily at certain ego-functions. She acknowledges, of course, the ultimate interdependence of all the factors.

In Wessman's study of Project ABC (see above, p it will be recalled that no sizable changes in achievement were recorded. In the area of personal changes, however, the matter was very different. Wessman, who interviewed the boys over a two-year period, reported: "One of the most striking impressions from the follow-up interviewing was the enormous growth in articulateness and personal expressiveness in the ABC boy."[1] The boys themselves, according to Wessman, reported as the most important changes "greater aspirations, increased self-awareness... self-confidence, and more tolerance...."[2]

Hodgkins and Stakenas compared Negro and white high school and college students in the Deep South. With socioeconomic status controlled, no significant difference existed between the groups of students in terms of self-assurance in school; the schools were segregated.[3] Epps, in his study of Negro and white students in the North and South, found that "... self-concept of ability is the strongest personality correlate of grades."[4]

Unexpectedly high educational aspirations and self-concept among Negro students have aroused skepticism among numerous researchers. Wylie and Hutchins state one view of the matter:[5]

---

[1] Wessman, *Evaluation of Project ABC*, p. 166.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

[3] Benjamin J. Hodgkins and Robert G. Stakenas, "A Study of Self-Concepts of Negro and White Youth in Segregated Environments," *Journal of Negro Education*, 38 (1969) 375.

[4] Edgar G. Epps, "Correlates of Academic Achievement Among Northern and Southern Urban Negro Students," *Journal of Social Issues*, 25 (1969), 64.

[5] Wylie and Hutchins, "*Schoolwork-Ability Estimates and Aspirations*," p. 799.

> Perhaps education is more valued among Negroes who must depend more heavily upon it than do comparable whites in order to improve their living situation. If so, the special value of education may create wishful thinking regarding their abilities to obtain that education, which tends to counteract the depressing effect of slurs they encounter.

This interpretation is difficult to assess apart from specific instances. Such an instance was provided by Wendland's study.

Wendland studied 681 Negro and white eighth graders attending segregated schools in North Carolina. She found that "the Negro adolescents do not report damaging self-evaluations or feelings of unworthiness, and in fact tend to view themselves more positively and optimistically than the white sample."[1] In trying to account for self-esteem differences between Negro and white she stated that "defensiveness alone would not seem to be an adequate explanation" and, even more concretely, "it is unlikely that defensiveness accounts for a significant portion of the variance."[2]

In the testing, Wendland found the Negroes in her sample scored high on cynicism and estrangement, adding up to a pronounced negative orientation toward the larger--and white society. Such an orientation, Wendland stresses, is not pathological; rather, it "reflects a realistic perception of the world as it often is for the Negro."[3] As we saw above (p. [illegible]) Gurin and associates have stressed the positive adaptive value of what Wendland refers to as "cynicism." Negro students thereby deny the existence of normal channels for personal progress and assert the futility of depending upon the benevolence of the majority. A high self-concept would seem to be an essential prerequisite in this psychological armamentarium.

---

[1] Marilyn Marie Wendland, Self-Concept In Southern Negro and White Adolescents As Related to Rural-Urban Residence (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, (1968); p. 62. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-1695).

[2] Ibid., pp. 81 and 103.

[3] Ibid., p. 108.

The Soareses studied 514 advantaged and disadvantaged children of varied ethnic backgrounds attending two schools. One of the schools, predominantly disadvantaged, had a population two-thirds Negro and Puerto Rican and one-third mainland white; the other school was advantaged and was ninety percent white. Self-concept was higher in the former school.[1]

Lewis studied the relation of self-concept to artistic creativity among college undergraduates. While southern white students scored highest on self-concept scores, Lewis characterized southern Negro students in his sample as follows: "In regard to general creativity, the group is highly exploratory and curious; desires verbal communication; and is fluent in visual production. The implication of these findings is that the group is sufficiently secure to strive for self-expressive communication."[2] These results should be taken as suggestive only since few statistical controls were used by Lewis.

In studying male undergraduates at three predominantly Negro colleges,[3] Escoffery found that a sense of fate-control was determined far more by contemporary social forces than by "personality makeup,"[1] Whether or not a Negro student believed that events in general were beyond his control, he tended to demand "freedom now."[2] He thereby asserted his belief that he could control that part of his "fate."

---

[1] Anthony T. Soares and Louise M. Soares, "Self Perceptions of Culturally Disadvantaged Children," American Educational Research Journal, 6 (1969), 37.

[2] Howard Edwin Lewis, A Descriptive Study of Self-Concept and General Creativity of Southern and Northern Undergraduate Students (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1966), p. 296. (University Microfilms Order No. 67-5937)

[3] Virginia State College, Petersburg; North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College, Greensboro; and Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland.

Bartee examined self-concept among Negro students in an all-Negro college (Bishop College) and a recently-desegregated white state college (East Texas State University). Two findings are relevant: (1) Neither group showed low self-concept and (2) Negro students in the desegregated college had higher self-concept scores than those in the all-Negro college.[3] It is not altogether clear that the two groups were closely matched.

Taylor studied desegregation effects on self-esteem in a Delaware school. After one year of desegregation, Negro self-esteem scores were significantly higher than a year earlier in a segregated school.[4] Interestingly, the scores receded somewhat between the fall and spring test and retest. Taylor attributes this development to the "changing national interracial climate" during 1965-1966. In Nashville, Binkley, studying children in apparently segregated schools, found that Negroes were not lower than whites in self-concept.[5] Gibby and Gabler conducted a study in Atlantic City schools, apparently racially homogeneous, and reported that Negro-white differences in self-concept were dependent on sex and I. Q. levels. There were, in fact, relatively few outright racial differences that were statistically significant. In general, the researchers described the white children as more realistic in their self-appraisals.[1]

---

[1] Aubrey Spencer Escoffery, Personality and Behavior Correlates of Negro American Belief in "Fate-Control" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1967), p. 82. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-1341).

[2] Ibid., p. 81.

[3] Geraldine McMurry Bartee, The Perceptual Characteristics Disadvantaged Negro and Caucasian College Students (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1967), pp. 83 and 120. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-1128).

[4] Charlotte P. Taylor, Some Changes in Self-Concept in the First Year of Desegregated Schooling: The Outward Walls and the Inward Scars (Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, 1967), p. 126. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-13, 169).

[5] Binkley, First Grade Entrance Variables, p. 98.

In an integrated Manhattan elementary school, Guggenheim studied the interrelationships of self-esteem and achievement expectation. Both Negro and white children tended to over-estimate their probable achievement, with the former significantly more so (86% vs. 58%).[2] This was especially true of children with high self-esteem. Guggenheim comments on the lack of support in his study for the belief that Negro children have low self-esteem. He is, in fact, struck by "this aspirational perseverance exhibited by Negro pupils in the face of their obvious low achievement...."[3] While both Negro and white children of high self-esteem had equally high achievement expectations, white students of low self-esteem had higher expectations than did Negro children of corresponding self-esteem. This latter finding is contrary to findings of many other studies; it might reflect a greater realism on the part of Negro students arising from the desegregated situation.

In Caplin's study, discussed earlier, it was found that Negro children in a desegregated school, matched on socioeconomic status with children in a segregated school, had higher self-concept scores.[4]

---

[1] Robert G. Gibby, Sr., and Robert Gabler, "The Self-Concepts of Negro and White Children," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 23 (1967), 147.

[2] Fred Guggenheim, "Self-Esteem and Achievement Expectations for White and Negro Children," Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 33 (1969), 67.

[3] Ibid., p. 70.

[4] Morris D. Caplin, "The Relationship between Self-Concept and Academic Achievement," Journal of Experimental Education, 37 (1969), 15.

This was especially true of school-related self-concept, which is in turn closely related to school achievement. On personal-related self-concept, no significant differences obtained between children in segregated and desegregated schools.

Georgeoff tested the effects of a new social studies teaching unit on Negro and white fourth-graders in Gary, Indiana; all twenty-six classes were integrated. The unit contained material on Negro life and history. Subjects were matched on I. Q; socioeconomic status, race, and achievement. The chief finding was that self-concept scores of both white and Negro students using the new unit were significantly higher, especially if they attended schools whose attendance area embraced integrated housing.[1] An especially interesting aspect of this study was the rise in self-concept of white students.

In Chicago, Posner studied self-evaluation of 300 Negro, Puerto Rican, and white first-grade children of differing intelligence and social class groups. Outright racial differences were not general throughout the study. Negro children showed a larger discrepancy than whites between self and ideal; on the other hand, while lower class Negro children had more negative self-images than lower class white children, no difference existed between middle class Negro and white children.[2] Among Negro children, social class difference makes a deep impression; the lower class Negro child was found by Posner to have very negative self-images. (This did not prevent the researcher from making an extraordinary overstatement: "For black Americans to be accepted as equals in the mainstream of

---

[1] Peter John Georgeoff, The Effect of the Curriculum Upon the Self-Concept of Children in Racially Integrated Fourth Grade Classrooms, 1968, p. 7. (ERIC # ED 017 020).

[2] Carmen A. Posner, Some Effects of Genetic and Cultural Variables on Self-Evaluations of Children (Doctoral dissertation, Illinois Institute of Technology, 1969), pp. 72-3, 76. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-9835).

American society, it is necessary that they develop a sense of self-respect.")[1] Like Rhodes, Posner found that parents' aspirations influenced significantly, perhaps crucially, the child's own aspirations and sense of self-worth.

Carpenter and Busse studied self-concept among eighty Negro and white first and fifth graders in an eastern city. All the children came from urban, father-absent, welfare families. Negro children had somewhat less positive self-concepts than white children.[2] For both groups, self-concept scores fell significantly from first to fifth grade; for white children, the drop was greater. Negro girl first-graders had the lowest self-concept.

Singer compared white and Negro fifth graders to discover the effect of segregation and desegregation on interracial attitudes.[3] Her general hypothesis follows:[4]

> A differential cognitive structure (the ability to maintain several attitudes and opinions simultaneously concerning another individual who is a member of the outgroup) and more positive attitudes, as a function of proximity and intelligence, should be found for children in the integrated school concerning their attitudes towards Negroes, when compared to the less differentiated perceptions and less positive attitudes towards Negroes held by the white child in a school where there is no contact with Negroes.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 98.

[2] Thomas R. Carpenter and Thomas V. Busse, "Development of Self-Concept in Negro and White Welfare Children," Child Development, 40 (1969), 938.

[3] Dorothy G. Singer, Interracial Attitudes of Negro and White Fifth-Grade Children in Segregated and Unsegregated Schools, (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-2836. See, also, Singer, "Reading, Writing, and Race Relations," Trans-Action, June, 1967.

[4] Ibid., p. 19.

Three schools were selected for the test: (1) a High Exposure School (HES), whose fifth-grade student body was sixty percent white and in which extensive interracial contact was evident; (2) two Low Exposure Schools (LES), one of whose fifth grade student body was all-white, and the other whose fifth-grade enrollment was 15 percent white. While I.Q. scores were similar for the two schools, the white students were primarily middle class, the Negroes lower income.

The white children in HES consistently scored lower on social distance toward Negroes. In accounting for white desire to have social contact with Negroes, Singer found exposure to be more important than either intelligence or sex. Unexpectedly, it did not appear that the brighter children were less prejudiced. Girls were, in general, less prejudiced than boys.

If Negro exposure to whites led to less anti-white prejudice, how did it affect Negro self-conception? Singer administered certain drawing tests to all children. Twenty-four Negro children colored the face of a figure supposed to be a self-portrait; not a single white child did so. More significant, perhaps, is the fact that 18 of the 24 were in HES. "In other words," observed Singer, "the Negro children who had greater contact with white children showed a tendency to differentiate themselves and assert their identity more clearly."[1]

Generally speaking, Negro children in HES had less regard for whites as academic achievers than did Negro children in LES. As Singer comments: "the segregated Negro may see the white world as one of success and his own world as one of failure...."[2] (This observation is supported by the research of Blake and Haggstrom; Meketon's work is also relevant.) The bright Negro girl in HES "can conceive of herself as achieving more than a white child, and turns to her own group rather than to whites for socialization."[3] Under integration, then, the Negro child is able "to differentiate himself without anxiety."[1] On the other hand, Negro children in the LES"were less accepting of their skin color, saw themselves as poorer achievers, and developed negative attitudes toward various nonwhite groups."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 99-101.

[2] Ibid., p. 105.

[3] Ibid., p. 108.

Children were not merely "exposed" to one another; they interacted with each other. True, white children usually rated Negro children as "aggressive" on tests; but this was fact, not prejudice. Despite this awareness, white children in HES still were more willing to associate with Negroes than were white children in LES. These latter white children, in fact, tended on tests to deny the existence of Negro aggression. As Singer noted: "Whites with no contact perceived the Negro in a distorted manner, giving him intellectual credit, but refusing to associate with him."[3]

An indication that change is occuring first among Negro parents and children can be seen in recent statistics regarding sales of "Negro-colored" dolls. Around Christmas, 1967, a Harlem department store was selling five Negro dolls for every white one, more than usual. According to Daniel M. O'Connell, manager of a national doll manufacturing firm, Negro doll sales increased by forty percent in 1965-1967. Edwin Nelson, Jr., president of another company, stated: "Originally they were most acceptable in Negro metropolitan markets. Now they are selling equally well in the South. Because of the civil rights movement, Negroes have developed a pride in themselves and their race and prefer to have children identify with their own race."[4] Harry C. Coards, president of a large toy firm, reported plans to integrate the wood people in its toys. (Although not mentioned by this industry survey, another possible explanation of the boom in Negro dolls is the large number of research projects on Negro self-concept which requires Negro dolls for experimental use!)

---

[1] Ibid., p. 109.

[2] Ibid., pp. 113-114.

[3] Ibid., p. 114.

[4] Associated Press story, Chicago Sun-Times, December 14, 1967.

Negro and white personality differences were studied by Frenkel.[1] One hundred fifty-three matched pairs were drawn from Oklahoma State University in Stillwater and Oakwood College, Huntsville, Alabama. The Negro sample had considerably higher mean socioeconomic status scores than the whites (55.8 vs. 37.5). On the tests, whites were found to have significantly higher anxiety scores; Frenkel had predicted the reverse. Negroes had higher social acquiescence scores. No racial differences were found on measures of ego-strength or aggression. Frenkel was especially interested in the lower Negro anxiety and explained it by noting that the Negroes attended an all-Negro school where "lack of competition with whites and lower need-achievement might result in lower anxiety."[2] He was struck most by the relative absence of racial differences on the personality measures. He was confident that such differences did exist in the past but there was reason to believe that the differences were diminishing. Since the rise of civil rights activity, Frenkel speculated, "Negroes meet with fewer frustrating situations and hence they have less need for aggressive behavior. Instead, they have a strong need to be accepted by society at large."[3]

Long and Henderson studied self-concept among children in a rural southern community.[4] Seventy-two Negro and seventy-two white children about to enter first grade, were tested. The white children, treated as a control group, differed significantly from the Negro group in I.Q; father's occupation, kindergarten experience, and other respects. Long and Henderson found that the Negro children had "a lower self-esteem ($p = .05$)...."[1] Significant differences on some of these variables were present within the Negro group. The researchers conclude that "for the Negro child, a realistic acceptance of the self as 'dark' may be one aspect of and possibly a prerequisite for an adequate self-esteem and a good relationship with peers."[2] The precise reasoning that led to this conclusion is somewhat unclear.

---

[1] Sinai Israel Frenkel, A Comparison Between Negro and White College Students on Several Personality Measures (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1966).

[2] Ibid., p. 69.

[3] Ibid., pp. 70-71.

[4] Barbara H. Long and Edmund H. Henderson, " "Self-Social Concepts of Disadvantaged School Beginners," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, September, 1966.

Garth studied self-concepts of Negro students in Louisville.[3] Forty-four Negro students who transferred to a heretofore all-white junior high school were compared with fifty Negro students who chose to remain in an all-Negro school. Transferees had higher I.Q. scores and grade point averages though the groups were comparable in socioeconomic status. (The higher I.Q. scores for transferees were accounted for by girls' scores; the boys did not show this difference.)

Transferees tended to be less favorable in self-concepts and were more severe in self-criticism. Garth states that the transferees "consistently describe 'Integrated High Schools' and 'White People' relatively favorably on the evaluative dimension and they score 'Negroes I know' and 'Lower Class People' as relatively impotent."[4]

Self-concept among four-year-old children was studied by Brown.[5] Thirty-eight Negro and Puerto Rican children of lower socioeconomic status were compared with thirty-six upper-middle class white children over a three week interval. In general, all the children showed highly positive self-conceptions. However, the Negro children on "self as subject" tended to conceive of themselves as:[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 5.

[2] Ibid., p.8.

[3] Charles E. Garth, Self-Concepts of Negro Students Who Transferred or Did Not Transfer to Formerly All-White High Schools, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1963).

[4] Ibid.,p. 132.

[5] Bert R. Brown, The Assessment of Self-Concept Among Four-Year-Old Negro and White Children: A Comparative Study Using the Brown-IDS Self Concept Referents Test (New York: Institute for Developmental Studies, New York University, 1966).

a. sad rather than happy
b. stupid rather than smart
c. sickly as distinguished from healthy
d. not liking their own facial appearance as opposed to evaluating their facial appearance favorably.

Brown cautioned that his project was a pilot study for a larger undertaking and its findings should therefore be regarded as tentative.

In Lockwood's study of sixth graders in upstate New York, no significant self-esteem difference was found between children in racially balanced and imbalanced schools. One exception, however, is enlightening: "For the item, 'I'm pretty happy, seventy-six percent of the students in the imbalanced schools responded with 'like me' and ninety percent of the students in balanced schools responded with similarity. Conversely, nineteen percent of the students in imbalanced schools and only seven percent in the balanced school responded with 'unlike me' "[2]

Clark and associates investigated self-concept among pre-school children.[3] Ninety-five Negro and fifty-two white children were compared with respect to self-concept and vocabulary. While vocabulary scores of white boys were significantly higher than those of Negro boys, no significant differences were found in the area of self-concept. (A general finding of overall high self-concept repeated Brown's finding.) Clark and associates warn: "... The repeated emphasis on the 'negative self-image' of Negro pre-school children in educational literature may need tempering lest it receive a spurious validation in the pre-school classroom by becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 26.

[2] Jane D. Lockwood, An Examination of Scholastic Achievement, Attitudes, and Home-Background Factors of Sixth-Grade Negro Students in Balanced and Unbalanced Schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966), p.53. (University Microfilms Order No. 67-8303).

[3] Edward T. Clark, Richard J. Ozenhosky, Anita I. Barz, and John V. O'Leary, "Self-Concept and Vocabulary Development in Negro and White Pre-School Children," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, April, 1967.

In Jonsson's study of Berkeley, discussed earlier, it will be recalled that he compared three groups of children: (1) Target children: enrolled in schools in poverty areas of the city; (2) Bused children: who had been enrolled in target schools but were bused to non-target schools, mainly middle-class white; and (3) Non-target: as just described; some served as receiving schools for the bused children. Jonsson first compared Target with non-Target children and found that the former "differentiated their responses less from item to item."[2] The implication is that Target children were somewhat rigidly defensive in their self-concept. Bused children, only 13 in number, responded very differently:[3]

> ... They differentiated their responses from item to item much more than did the pupils of the target school, and showed no tendency to have a positive response set.... An equally marked difference is in the number of negative item averages for bused pupils.... The bused children consistently rated themselves less positively on achievement-related items than did the target pupils and, fairly consistently, a little lower than did the non-target group.

---

[1] Ibid., p.5.

[2] Jonsson, Report of Evaluation of ESEA Title I, p. 46.

[3] Ibid., pp. 54-55.

It will be recalled that Jonsson earlier reported that the bused students' academic gains, while modest, exceeded expectations.

RACIAL SELF-AWARENESS

The Clarks conducted a series of studies reported between 1939 and 1950. Their subjects were Negro pre-school children in Washington, D.C. and New York City. In the former city, the children attended segregated institutions; in the latter, a Negro group and a mixed group. Only the Washington sample, it was noted, was large enough to yield dependable conclusions. The Clarks used dolls and crayons with which to elicit racial self-conceptions from these young children.

Negro children, given two choices of identifying with a white or a Negro doll, tended to choose the white doll.[1] Choice of the Negro doll was more frequent in the all-Negro nursery schools. In any event, age was directly related to choice of the Negro doll.[2] Light-skinned Negro children chose Negro dolls less frequently than did dark-skinned Negro children. The Clarks explained their findings by contending that "consciousness of self as different from others on the basis of observed skin color precedes any consciousness of self in terms of socially defined group differences in these Negro children."[3] To the youngsters, "light Negro" skin most resembled "white" skin; " dark Negro" skin was sharply different from both other hues.

---

[1] Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie K. Clark, "The Development of Consciousness of Self and the Emergence of Racial Identification in Negro Preschool Children," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10 (1939).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 598.

[3] Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie K. Clark, "Skin Color As a Factor in Racial Identification of Negro Preschool Children," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 11 (1940)

Thus, the Clarks interpreted the young children's color consciousness as not equivalent to race consciousness.

Did integration retard the Negro child's self-awareness and racial identification? The small size of the Clarks' integrated sample precluded a definite answer. More research would be needed, they agreed.[1]

Evidence derived by the Clarks from the children's crayon work led to similar conclusions. By age five, "the Negro child... is aware of the fact that to be colored in contemporary American society is a mark of inferior status."[2] The Clarks distinguished between racial self-awareness and racial preference: "... By the age of seven the Negro child cannot escape self-identification, but many... indicate a clear-cut preference for white...."[3] They called for "a definite mental hygiene and educational program that would relieve children of the tremendous burden of feelings of inadequacy and inferiority...."[4] All but a tiny percentage of the Negro children referred to attended segregated schools.

Radke and associates studied racial self-awareness among primary-grade children in the public schools of Philadelphia. Using the doll-technique, she found that 89 percent of the white children preferred the white doll while 57 percent of the Negro children chose the Negro doll. Also evident was the children's awareness of some of the social concomitants of race in America. "... Part of the children's concepts of race include the factors of occupations, clothing, and housing."[1] In five schools studied, the percentage Negro ranged from zero to one hundred. White children overwhelmingly rejected Negro children, whether any were actual classmates or not. Nevertheless, nearly three-quarters of the Negro children, when asked whether a Negro boy in a picture was glad to be a Negro, replied in the affirmative.[2] At the same time, Negro children indicated ambivalent feelings toward self-identification as a Negro.

---

[1] Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie K. Clark, "Segregation as a Factor in the Racial Identification of Negro Pre-School Children: A Preliminary Report," Journal of Experimental Education, 8 (1939-1940), 163.

[2] Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie K. Clark, "Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children," Journal of Negro Education, 19 (1950), 350.

[3] Ibid., p. 349.

[4] Ibid., p. 350.

At the Ruggles Street Nursery School in Boston, Massachusetts, Goodman studied twenty-seven Negro and white children, ranging in age from 2.9 years to 4.4 years. She reported: "None of the subjects... had yet developed true race attitudes, but all gave evidence of slight to full awareness of their own racial identity and that of others."[3] The Negro children seemed more sensitive to racial matters and hesitated more to discuss them. Yet, Goodman observed that "most of the subjects... do not manifest reluctance toward cross-racial hospitality."[4]

Powell studied racial awareness among four-year-olds in a majority-Negro nursery school located on the campus of a predominantly Negro college. While the number of children was small (eleven Negro and four white), a rewarding study was conducted. Children were asked to choose dolls, fit together different colored pieces of a puzzle made up of family members, and arrange play groups around a set of miniature life toys. The white doll was preferred by seventy-six percent of the Negro children, thus indicating that the general cultural preference for white had already been absorbed. On the other hand, Powell emphasized that racial awareness was most unstable among the children. As for behavior in the nursery school, she reported that "Negro and white children in the research group play as much with peers of the other race as they do with peers of their own race."[1] As benign as relations were, however, racial differences did crop up from time to time. Powell was led to observe that "interracial groups even at the preschool level cannot be effective in accomplishing their aims unless teachers take an active part in helping children to understand and accept racial differences."[2]

---

[1] Marian J. Radke and Helen G. Trager, "Children's Perceptions of the Social Roles of Negroes and Whites," Journal of Social Psychology, 29 (1950), 33.

[2] Marian J. Radke, Helen G. Trager, and Hadassah Davis, "Social Perceptions and Attitudes of Children," Genetic Psychology Monographs, 40 (1949), 377.

[3] Mary Ellen Goodman, "Evidence Concerning the Genesis of Interracial Attitudes," American Anthropologist, 48 (1946), 625.

[4] Ibid., p. 627.

[5] Alice Mendham Powell, Racial Awareness and Social Behavior in an Interracial Four-Year-Old Group (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1958), p. 81 (University Microfilms).

Gregor and McPherson studied racial attitudes in two segregated schools in the Deep South. Subjects were eighty-three white middle class students and ninety-two Negro lower class students. In a doll exercise, ninety-five percent of the Negroes identified with the Negro doll and about half preferred the doll over a white doll.[3] In several respects, these results compared with those found by Radke in integrated and segregated schools in Philadelphia. Also, it is not clear what impact the difference in socioeconomic status had on the findings of Gregor and McPherson. The researchers raise the question of whether segregation might not have a beneficial effect on racial self-identification.[4]

Stabler and associates examined race attitudes of sixty-seven Negro and white children in Head Start and public school classes. Working with responses to identification of black-bad and white-good, the researchers concluded from this that "the racial attitudes of the larger society have been incorporated by preschool children of both races, but by white children more so than by Negro children."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 95.

[2] Ibid., p. 130.

[3] A. James Gregor and D. Angus McPherson, "Racial Attitudes Among White and Negro Children in a Deep South Standard Metropolitan Area," Journal of Social Psychology, 68 (1966), 100.

[4] Ibid., p. 105.

The hair area of human figure-drawings was studied by Frisch and Handler as a clue to racial self-attitudes. It had been noted in the past that in such drawings by Negro children, "the hair area was grossly over-emphasized and distorted."[2] Drawings were collected from a sample of 122 Negro and 103 white children of similar economic background. Two judges, without knowing the artists, were highly successful in separating the drawings by race of artist. In the great predominance of the drawings by Negro children the ratio of hair area to face area was significantly larger. The researchers interpreted their finding as "a cultural reflection of the Negro's desire for assimilation and integration."[3]

Dennis analyzed the changing racial composition of drawings by students at Howard University in 1957 and 1967. In the earlier study he could discern no Negro in the drawings. In the later study, about eighteen percent of the figures were unmistakably Negro.[4] Dennis speculated that the increase probably occurred during 1965-1967, a period of upsurge of black nationalist sentiment. An indication of a parallel development is contained in a study of Howard University students by Bayton and Muldrow. The researchers tested the ability of light-skinned and dark-skinned Negro students to take each other's role. They concluded:[1]

---

[1] John R. Stabler, Edward E. Johnson, and Melvyn A. Berke, The Relationship Between Race and Perception of Racially-Related Stimuli in Preschool Children, 1967, p.8 (ERIC # ED 030 483).

[2] Giora R. Frisch and Leonard Handler, "Differences in Negro and White Drawings: A Cultural Interpretation," Perceptual and Motor Skills, 24 (1967), 667.

[3] Ibid., p. 669.

[4] Wayne Dennis, "Racial Change in Negro Drawings," Journal of Psychology, 69 (1968), 130.

> ... Light-skin Negro males occupy some psychologically marginal status which makes them especially reponsive to skin color cues emanating from other Negroes. Furthermore, they see dark Negroes as having more desirable personality characteristics than light Negroes possess. The data further suggest that light-skin Negro males are somewhat "uncomfortable" in their position vis-a-vis dark Negroes.

The results of both these studies become more understandable in view of the growth of "blackness" sentiment on the campus of Howard University during these years.

Greenwald and Oppenheim sharply reduced the percentage of Negro nursery children who misidentified their race. This was accomplished by using a "mulatto" doll in addition to a white and a dark brown one. In the Clarks' northern sample, studied in 1939, thirty-nine percent of the Negro children misidentified themselves; in the present study--data for which were collected in 1961--the percentage declined to thirteen.[2] (The Clarks' study was done in New York City; the present one in New York City and New Rochelle, New York.) Greenwald and Oppenheim conclude that Negro children do not misidentify their race more than white children do. Apparently one possible explanatory factor was not explored by the researchers: the Clarks' northern sample was an all-Negro group and a very small integrated group--the latter too small to yield any dependable conclusions. The more recent study may have used integrated nursery schools. This might have contributed to the changed findings. A noteworthy feature of the Greenwald-Oppenheim research is its finding that white children misidentify their race to a much greater extent than Negroes (forty-four percent and thirteen percent.) Finally, despite the accuracy of Negro self-identification, Negro children still preferred to play with white rather than the mulatto or dark brown doll.

---

[1] James A. Bayton and Tressie W. Muldrow, "Interacting Variables in the Perception of Racial Personality Traits," Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 3 (1968), 43-44.

[2] Herbert J. Greenwald and Don B. Oppenheim, "Reported Magnitude of Self-Misidentification Among Negro Children--Artifact?" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8 (1968), 51.

Asher and Allen studied race preference in a largely segregated sample of 341 Negro and white children in Newark, New Jersey. The settings were not schools. Using puppets instead of dolls, the researchers found a uniform preference of white and rejection of brown puppets by both Negro and white children.[1] It was noted that there were no statistically significant differences between the outcomes in the present research and that of the Clarks. Asher and Allen, however, erroneously state that the Clarks' northern sample was integrated. (See above, p. 143) In a study of race drawings by Negro and white adolescents in Northern Virginia, Wise found that "seventy percent of the Negro and eighty percent of the white adolescents reported that the figure they had drawn was 'white' "[2]

Two studies of racial awareness of white children in North Carolina are of interest. Studying sixty five-year-olds in Charlotte, Diamant found that the children were conscious of racial differences but were unprejudiced. They were asked to make "families" of a combination of white and Negro dolls. Diamant found that the "children of five years who were of normal intelligence did not refrain from calling a Negro child doll a child of white doll parents, regardless of parental attitudes towards civil rights."[1] Diamant speculated that at age five the Gestalt of the family proved too strong to be overcome by the counterforce of racial prejudice. Williams and Edwards studied eighty-four five-year-old middle class white children in Winston-Salem. Procedures were used to affect the children's tendency to identify the color black negatively and white positively. The result was that "children whose black-white concept attitudes had been weakened subsequently showed somewhat less tendency to evaluate Negroes negatively and Caucasians positively."[2]

---

[1] Steven R. Asher and Vernon L. Allen, "Racial Preference and Social Comparison Processes," Journal of Social Issues, 25 (1969), 161.

[2] James H. Wise, "Self-Reports by Negro and White Adolescents to the Draw-a-Person," Perceptual and Motor Skills, 28 (1969), 194.

Morland compared race awareness in Boston and Lynchburg, Virginia.[3] He matched four groups of forty-one Negro and white children, ages three to six. A majority in each group preferred whites over Negroes. White self-identification exceeded Negro self-identification. The white model was especially strong among southern children:

---

[1] Louis Diamant, "Relationships between Intelligence and Parental Attitudes and Race Awareness in Five-Year-Olds," Journal of Social Psychology, 77 (1969), 256.

[2] John E. Williams and C. Drew Edwards, "An Exploratory Study of the Modification of Color and Racial Concept Attitudes in Preschool Children," Child Development, 40 (1969), 748.

[3] J. Kenneth Morland, "A Comparison of Race Awareness in Northern and Southern Children," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, January, 1966; see, also, by Morland: Racial Recognition in Nursery School Children in Lynchburg, Virginia," Social Forces, December, 1958; "Racial Acceptance and Preference of Nursery School Children in a Southern City," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, VIII (1962); "Racial Self-Identification: A Study of Nursery School Children," American Catholic Sociological Review, Fall, 1963; and "The Development of Racial Bias in Young Children" Theory Into Practice, II (1963).

southern whites were more race-conscious than northern whites, and southern Negroes were significantly more likely to prefer whites.[1] Morland holds that "preference for one race... did not mean rejection of the other race, for the great majority in the four groupings accepted members of both races when no choice was required...."[2] He acknowledges that this interpretation is at odds with previous studies.[3]

Fundamentally, observes Morland, America is racist although it need not remain so:[4]

> ... American society as it now operates teaches that racial differences are very important and that being white is preferable to being Negro. Under such conditions young Negro children probably learn to prefer and identify with the dominant race.... The results of this study on race awareness in young children suggest that as the sociocultural milieu in American changes, such awareness will change.

Which--Negro or white--would change first Morland did not say.

Morland also conducted a comparative study of race awareness among 450 Hong Kong Chinese and Negro and white American children, ranging in age from four to six years. While both Hong Kong and the United States are multiracial societies, in the former the Chinese are of parallel, not subordinate, status to that of the British. In the U.S., of course, the Negroes and whites are in a subordinate-superordinate power relationship. Morland set out to discover whether racial awareness of children responded to these differences. "The great majority of respondents," according to Morland, "accepted both their own and the other race."[1] Negro children while tending to accept their race also showed more conflict over race-identity. The Chinese children were more self-accepting and less stressful about the matter. This, Morland held, was to be expected inasmuch as "in such a society there is no dominant race to maintain its superior position and no subordinate race to show unconscious preference for and identification with the dominant race."[2] To Morland, the study suggested that once American society changed so that Negroes ceased being subordinate, "the racial preference and racial self-identification of Negro children will change."[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 29.

[2] Ibid., p. 26.

[3] See, especially, by Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie Clark: (1) "The Development of Consciousness of Self and the Emergence of Racial Identification in Negro Pre-School Children," Journal of Social Psychology, November, 1939; (2) "Segregation as a Factor in the Racial Identification of Negro Pre-School Children, a Preliminary Report," Journal of Experimental Education, December, 1939.

[4] Ibid., p. 29.

It may be of some interest to examine the relationship of race consciousness and attitude toward persons of another race from an adult perspective. Noel studied this relationship using 515 adult Negroes as his subjects.[4] The subjects were divided into two classifications, with reference to ethnic identification. (1) Identifiers, or those who had a positive identification with Negroes as a group, and (2) Disparagers, those who had a negative identification. Noel found that "Negroes who are militantly identified with the minority group are consistently more favorably inclined toward integration, both in attitude and action, than are Negroes who disparage the in-group."[5] In other words, those

---

1. J. Kenneth Morland, "Race Awareness among American and Hong Kong Chinese Children," American Journal of Sociology, 75 (1969), 366.

2. Ibid., p. 371.

3. Ibid., p. 374.

3. Donald L. Noel, "Minority Group Identification and Societal Integration," unpublished paper presented at the 1966 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association.

4. Ibid., p. 5.

who felt most Negro were likely to be at least anti-white. Ethnic consciousness need not necessarily become ethnocentrism.

Noel explored the relationship of ethnic identification to "defensive insulation." Respondents who accepted the following proposition were classed as believers in defensive insulation: "It is best to stay away from white people; then you will avoid all embarrassing situations." Table 3 reports the data:

TABLE 1

ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION AND DEFENSIVE INSULATION

Believe in Defensive Insulation	(N = 229) Identifiers	(N = 180) Ambivalents	(N = 106) Disparagers
Yes	16%	28%	56%
No	84	72	44

This highly significant difference (beyond the .001 level) points up the socially constructive function of ethnic consciousness. What Noel calls "positive group identification"[1] is precisely what Singer described as Negro children "differentiating themselves."

III. CONCLUSIONS

If high Negro self-concept and aspiration are only recent discoveries of social scientists, it is not because they only recently arose. Cox points out: "Even as far back as the days of slavery Negro aspiration was everywhere evident. We could not conceive of an institution of hope, such as the Negro spirituals, developing among the lower castes of India...."[1] Bond explained sardonically years ago: "For it is self-respect that gives to the American Negro that inner security in the face of real or fancied injuries which was accorded him as a member of a group definitely in its place."[2] A contemporary researcher, Coopersmith, accounts for the coexistence of oppression and high self-esteem: "... It is not discrimination per se but the person's acceptance of his oppressor's judgment and standards, and rejection of his own standards that is likely to produce self-devaluation."[3]

---

[1] See, also, Gary Marx, Protest and Prejudice. A Study of Belief in the Black Community (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), pp. 196-197, on self-image and out-group hostility.

Guggenheim, as we saw earlier, studied self-esteem among children in Harlem (p. 134.) He reported that low self-esteem appeared not to be a problem. Then, he proceeded to important practical application of his findings:[4]

> The results of this study certainly raise a question concerning the validity of pre-kindergarten and elementary school programs for disadvantaged Negro children that have as a primary goal the raising of self-esteem.... Strong evidence from this and other studies... indicate... that many disadvantaged Negro children's school problems center around low achievement and not low self-esteem.

---

1. Oliver C. Cox, Caste, Class, and Race: A Study in Social Dynamics (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1959, orig. 1948). p. 441.

2. Horace Mann Bond, "Self-Respect as a Factor in Racial Advancement," Annals, 140 (1928), 23.

3. Stanley Coopersmith, Psychological Deprivation and the Development of Self-Esteem: Comments and Recommendations (Bethesda, Maryland: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1968), p. 9.

4. Guggenheim, "Self-Esteem and Achievement Expectations," p. 70.

Coopersmith takes a step beyond:[1]

> It may be that pride evocation is a rapid procedure for gaining esteem, and if so, may well serve as a first step in programs to increase initiative and motivation. However, unless esteem is subsequently related to skills, performance, etc. the motivation aroused may be socially unproductive.

Some time ago, Erikson explored this question with great wisdom. Two aspects of the general subject of identity are of interest here: (a) its substantive content and (b) its social-psychological dimensions. Both are illustrated by the following statements by Erikson:[2]

> In this, children cannot be fooled by empty praise and condescending encouragement. They may have to accept artificial bolstering of their self-esteem in lieu of something better, but what I call their accruing ego identity gains real strength only from wholehearted and consistent recognition of real accomplishment, that is, achievement that has meaning in their culture.

And further:[3]

> Identity formation goes beyond the process of identifying oneself with ideal others in a one-way fashion; it is a process based on a heightened cognitive and emotional capacity to let oneself be identified by concrete persons as a circumscribed individual in relation to a predictable universe which transcends the family.

---

[1] Coopersmith, Psychological Deprivation and the Development of Self-Esteem, p. 15.

[2] Erik H. Erikson, "A Memorandum on Identity and Negro Youth," Journal of Social Issues, 20 (1964), 32.

[3] Ibid., p. 33.

Through much of the more recent literature on self-esteem appears the emphasis upon the cognitive dimension. Without such a consideration, we are left with hardly more than esteem-uplift. (One of the undoubted advantages of such programs is their low-cost--in money.)

We have seen that aspirations arise out of extensive interaction between the individual and his fellowmen. Also, it is clear that while the highest aspirations can and do arise from the meanest circumstances, they often lead to little. Just how realistic these aspirations are is less pressing a question than is ordinarily thought. Nobody has yet demonstrated a greater Negro propensity toward fantasy.

How might we summarize the principal implications of the research reviewed in this chapter?

1. Negro students' aspirations are as high and often higher than those of white students.
2. If realism is defined by its correspondence with the status quo, then Negro youth in college are highly realistic aspirants.
3. The social climate of the school constitutes an autonomous influence upon aspirations.
4. If the community as a whole were to raise its aspirations for the low-status student, including the Negro, there would probably be an enormous educational stride forward.
5. To disentangle the separate effects of race and class upon self-concept is extremely difficult.
6. Desegregation has most often benefited the Negro child's self-esteem and virtually never harmed it.
7. Historical factors such as the civil rights movement are critical in raising self-esteem of Negro children.
8. Desegregation has facilitated Negro acceptance of color as a constructive factor, while heightening Negro willingness to live and learn with whites.

Let us now turn to studies which examine the day-to-day interplay of student-and-student and student-and-teacher.

CHAPTER 4

THE STUDENT IN SCHOOL AND IN THE FAMILY

In this chapter are explored four different aspects of desegregation: (1) How do students of one race relate to students of another race? (2) What are the relations of minority student and teacher? (3) How does the family influence the desegregated school situation? and (4) How might the major desegregation effects discussed in chapter two, three, and the present one be seen from the viewpoint of social psychological theory?

1. THE STUDENT AND OTHER STUDIES

Criswell studied interracial attitudes of Negro and white elementary school children in New York City; they attended three non-segregated schools.[1] In the earliest grades, there was little mutual withdrawal because of race; the most popular children of the majority interrelate with children of the minority. By the fifth grade, both phenomena change. Consistently, white children show more group self-preference. In the intermediate grades, Negro children sense the exclusion. As Criswell points out:

> There was distinct evidence that these white and Negro children of nearly the same socio-economic status, were fundamentally less congenial with seatmates chosen from the other race. The situation is most simply viewed as one in which the whites show primary self-preference, a growing sense of racial

---

[1] Joan H. Criswell, A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavage in the Classroom (New York: Archives of Psychology, January, 1939).

> kinship dependent on community attitudes, while Negroes develop a secondary preference dependent on the increasing withdrawal of the whites and on the Negroes' keener sensitivity to this withdrawal.[1]

The character of white friendships with Negro children varied with the color composition of the classroom. In a predominantly white classroom, white children have a larger element of choice as to whether or not to strike up a friendship with a Negro classmate; thus they can choose more spontaneously, and the result is a more intimate relationship. In predominantly Negro classrooms, however, the choice is a narrower one, and thus the resulting relationship is less spontaneous and intimate.

Over a quarter-century ago, Boone studied the life of Negro students at the University of Michigan. Bitterly, he concluded:

> ... The Negro student in attending a white school may expect to find the denial of unlimited opportunity, the occurrence of social embarrassments, and the concrete proof that American democracy is the white man's democracy--just as he has already experienced in everyday life.[2]

This indictment highlights at least two crucial questions to be asked about student relations under desegregation: (1) do these relations encourage the minority student to transform opportunity into actual achievement, and (2) what is the quality of everyday human contacts in the school?

The Williams-Ryan 1954 study reported of the few Negro students in desegregated schools: "... They tended to keep themselves apart unless sought out for the more informal activities connected with school or for social occasions.... What evidence there is points to an impersonal friendliness in school and school-related activities, along with some withdrawal to like groups after school."[1] Researchers for the American Political Science Association interviewed five Negro students in each of twenty-three predominantly white colleges.[2] Respondents reported that they attended all school events as well as informal and social affairs. "As to more subtle matters, the Negro students interviewed in most instances believed that they were not accepted on their individual merit either by the administration or the general student body.... The Negro student at a predominantly white college continues to feel that he is thought of as different, or as an outsider."

---

[1] Ibid., p. 79.

[2] W. H. Boone, "Problems of Adjustment of Negro Students at a White School," Journal of Negro Education, October, 1942, p. 483. See, also, in the same issue the engaging article by Edythe Hargrave, "How I Feel as A Negro at a White College."

The attitudes of white ninth and tenth graders toward Negroes were measured before, and seven months after desegregation. No change in attitudes resulted; classroom contact with Negroes seemed without consequence. The researcher did find that white prejudice against Negroes increased as white scholastic averages fell.[3] In a study in the Washington, D.C., area, Dunn found "high authoritarian tendencies are prone to be accompanied by unfavorable attitudes toward integrated /desegregated/ schools and vice versa."[4] Somewhat contrarily, another researcher found

---

1. Robin M. Williams, Jr., and Margaret W. Ryan eds, Schools in Transition. Community Experiences in Desegregation (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954), p. 244.

2. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Equal Protection of the Laws in Public Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960).

3. Donald N. Lombardi, "Factors Affecting Change in Attitude Toward Negroes Among High School Students," Journal of Negro Education, Spring, 1963.

4. Theodore F. Dunn, Assumed Racial Similarity as Related to Attitudes Toward Integration (Doctoral dissertation, American University, 1958), abstract in Dissertation Abstracts, XIX, 1959, p. 2533.

white student attitudes toward Negroes were not related to self-concept.[1] Dwyer reported that informal associations thrived among younger children and increased with time.[2] In a Southern California school, Negroes and Spanish-speaking students participated very little, ability grouping added to the social distance separating Negroes from whites.[3]

Webster studied the effects of interracial contacts upon interracial attitudes.[4] He selected a sample of sixty-white students and forty-five Negro students in a Richmond, California junior high school. Parents of two groups of children varied widely in terms of occupations and educational attainment. Control groups of children were chosen in schools where no interracial contact was possible; the Negro parents came predominantly from the South. After six months of contact, the Negro students had become more socially accepting of whites than whites were of Negroes; Webster had predicted this. On the other hand, he also found that white students who had experienced interracial contact had become, after six months, less accepting than were the white control students who had not experienced any interracial contact. How could this anomalous finding be explained?

---

[1] Claye, A Study of the Relationship Between Self-Concepts and Attitudes Toward the Negro, pp. 87-88.

[2] Robert J. Dwyer, "A Report on Patterns of Interaction in Desegregated Schools," Journal of Educational Sociology, March, 1958.

[3] Hilda Taba, School Culture Studies of Partic- and Leadership (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1955), p. 95.

[4] Staten W. Webster, Intergroup Contact in a Newly Integrated School and Its Effects Upon the Levels of Acceptance and Friendship Choices of a Selected Group of Seventh-Grade Pupils (Doctoral dissertation, Universtiy of California, Berkeley, 1960); see, also Webster, "The Influence of Interracial Contact on Social Acceptance in a Newly Integrated School," Journal of Educational Psychology, LII (1961)

Webster noted that he had been unable to pre-test the white control students. There is thus some question whether a strict comparison could be made between white control and experimental group changes over the six-month period. Webster noted four specific factors in the local scene that were unfavorable to friendly interracial contacts: (1) physical aggression had marked the beginning of desegregation; (2) Negroes resented the obvious avoidance-behavior of white classmates; (3) white students held stereotyped conceptions about Negroes; and (4) parental support was expressed for on-going tendencies and did not encourage friendship. Webster concluded that (1) contact of itself is insufficient without adult guidance; (2) the initial conflict between Negro and white was never overcome and was allowed to stand in the way of improvement; (3) without a broad community program of positive acceptance, interracial classroom behavior cannot be changed in fundamental ways; and (4) six months may be too short a time in which to develop constructive interracial attitudes.

Commenting upon Webster's study, Haggstrom interprets the weight of relevant research as indicating that "Negro children benefit in a number of ways from direct comparison and competition with white children regardless of the attitudes of children toward them...."[1]

Thomas, the principal of a Chicago upper middle-class private school, discussed the procedures whereby a small number of Negro children are incorporated within the routines of the school. Negro children are encouraged by the presence of some Negro teachers. Racial intermarriage is a widespread concern among white parents and the school takes special pains to make this point to students. In 1947, when the decision to desegregate was made, a school discussion of intermarriage "brought general agreement that at an early age boys and girls would realize that they go to school with many people whom they value as friends and associates but whom they had best not consider as potential mates."[1] Thomas reported further: "For some time Negroes have testified that going to the school with a white majority has taught them to face reality. For instance they realize that mixed dating is not widely accepted."[2]

---

[1] Haggstrom, "Segregation, Desegregation, and Negro Personality," pp. 20-21.

Lee studied race relations in a Connecticut town of 10,000 people, located ten miles from a city of 125,000.[3] "The school system is the freest area of behavior for Negroes," states Lee.[4] Inside the high school, there are many interracial best-friend relationships. For most of the town's Negro youth who live in a concentrated area; the interior of a white house is an unknown quantity, very few white youths ever visit a Negro fellow student. With regard, however, to Negroes and whites who live near one another, "they see much more of each other /and/ visit more often and intimately...."[5]

Berlin, a psychiatrist who had served as a consultant to the San Francisco school system, explained the occurrence of discipline problems among Negro youth who were placed in heretofore all-white schools: "They want very much to become accepted in the new setting and yet they feel so hopelessly behind the other youngsters that they begin, almost inevitably, to resort to the only behavior thay have learned to use to cope with such distressing feelings."[6] This aspect of desegregation was presented as though it were typical. The only other statement of a similar view is by

---

[1] Cleveland A. Thomas, "The Independent School and Desegregation," School Review, 69 (1961), p. 272.

[2] Ibid., p. 275.

[3] Frank F. Lee, Negro and White in Connecticut Town (New York: Bookman, 1961).

[4] Ibid., p. 76.

[5] Ibid., p. 61.

[6] I. N. Berlin, "Desegregation Creates Problems, Too," Saturday Review, June 15, 1963.

Vredevoe[1] His statements, however, cannot be checked, for the specific instances are not identified nor is the source of any fact given.

Herriott and St. John give a more balanced report and probably more broadly based view when they report a significant but not overwhelming discipline problem in schools whose populations are from lower socioeconomic levels.[2]

In the Clark-Plotkin study of Negro college students, discussed in the preceding chapter, students did report considerable integration in classroom and extra-curriculum. Nevertheless, the researchers note an "undercurrent theme of racial discrimination."[3]

St. John studied interracial association in a de facto segregated New England high school.[4] The researcher found, contrary to expectations, that Negroes were not less active than whites, that Negroes held more offices than did whites, and that there was no relationship between a Negro student's attendance at a segregated elementary school and his interracial contacts in high school. On the other hand, a strong negative relationship was found to exist between the interracial associations of Negro high school students and the average percent of Negro children who had attended their elementary school. It was found that white children more often chose northern Negro children as friends than they did children who had grown up in the South. Also, white students were found readier than Negroes to initiate a personal friendship. The desegregated situation studied by the researcher had existed for eighteen months.

---

[1] Lawrence E. Vredevoe, "The Effort to Desegregate and Its Effects Upon School Discipline and Attitudes," Journal of Secondary Education, February, 1967; an earlier article by the same author restates the same arguement: "The Effects of Desegregation on School Discipline," Education Digest, April, 1965.

[2] Robert E. Herriott and Nancy H. St. John, Social Class and the Urban School. The Impact of Pupil Background on Teachers and Principals (New York: Wiley, 1966), p. 51.

[3] Clark and Plotkin, The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges, p. 29.

[4] Nancy H. St. John, "De Facto Segregation and Interracial Association in High School," Sociology of Education, Summer, 1964.

The first two Negro graduates of the University of Georgia experienced, at best, indifference, and, at worst, isolation. During his two and a half years at the university, Hamilton Holmes "had never eaten in a university dining hall, studied in the library, used the gymnasium, or entered the snack bar. No white student had ever visited him, and he had never visited one of them."[1] His classmate, Charlayne Hunter, received many letters of encouragement telling her she was not really alone. "But," commented Miss Hunter, "I look around and I don't see anybody else."

Five years after graduating, Miss Hunter visited the University of Georgia. More Negro students were enrolled and a Negro admissions counseler, Ben Colebert, was employed. When black students complained to him of the unfriendliness of white students, and the possible advantage of attending a Negro college, Colebert told them "that you get more awareness of being black here than in a black institution where it's taken for granted."[2] Joe Sales, a black senior, explained to Miss Hunter why only a minority of Negroes on campus belonged to the Black Students Union: "You see, there's a basic division between those students who come from predominantly black schools and people who went to a white high school. The ones who went to a white high school are more willing to relate."[3] Miss Hunter addressed herself to the cases of two Negro students who spoke with pain of their campus experience: "Joe and Andy are appalled at the treatment they are receiving at the University of Georgia because for the first time in their lives, they are feeling it personally. Discrimination through separate and unequal schooling is not something you feel personally."[1]

---

[1] 1. Calvin Trillin, An Education in Georgia. The Integration of Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes (New York:Viking, 1964), p. 58. See, also, Hansjorg Elshorst, "Two Years After Integration: Race Relations at a Deep South University," Phylon, Spring, 1967; the school is Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge.

[2] 2. Charlayne Hunter, "A Homecoming for the First Black Girl at the University of Georgia," New York Times Magazine, January 25, 1970, p. 55.

[3] 3. Ibid., p.58.

Negro-white intelligence disparities constitute one of the outstanding issues of contention in this area. Some argue that the disparities are racial and constitute a reasonable bar to desegregation; this viewpoint is explored further in Chapter VIII. Others contend that the disparities are primarily environmental in origin and can be overcome with a carefully constructed classroom regimen. Holders of both views, however, often accept the scientific validity of the I.Q. score. Lusienski noted that Negro I.Q. scores on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) have come from southern Negro children. Is it justified to assume that they are also representative of northern Negro children? To answer this question, he tested a large population of lower-class northern Negro (and white) boys living in Boys Town, Nebraska.[2]

Lusienski found no significant differences on the Full Scale WISC I.Q. He did observe an interesting variation: "There was some tendency... for the Negro sample to excel on those tests calling for maturity or experience, while the whites reflected similar advantage on cultural and scholastic background."[3] Racists were warned by Lusienski that they could find no comfort in his findings. Referring to the close similarities of Negro and white scores, he concluded: "The likenesses are the more striking when the Negro group's scores are measured against those of others of their race who have been described in previous WISC investigations.

---

1. Ibid., p. 65.

2. Dean R. Lusienski, An Analysis of the Scores of Urban Negro Boys on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1964). University Microfilms Order No. 64-11, 936.

3. Ibid., p. 68.

Drawn from southern populations, they had almost nothing in common with the Boys Town colored boys."[1]

Bradley studied close school friendships held by Negro high school and college students in Baltimore.[2] "More than twice as many of the college group and three times as many of the secondary school group indicated that their closest friend, ranked as number one, was a Negro, ... /than/ indicated that their closest friend similarly ranked, was white." Desegregation was held to have encouraged interracial friendships.

Bindman made student relations the central subject of his inquiry at the University of Illinois. The Negro student, according to Bindman, "feels isolated, alienated, and disaffected from the University System."[3] Few white students initiated any close personal relationships with Negro students and the campus normative structure directed interracial activities into the more impersonal realm of campus life. Here, equality reigned--until it hurt. The overwhelming impersonality of the campus struck Negro students hardest. Not a single Negro belonged to a white fraternity where informal information and academic assistance could have been obtained. Instead, the campus Negro group "is made up of peers with the same paucity of information, and knowledge, particularly about the formal system."[4] They don't know their way around.

Jonsson's study of Berkeley discovered that the busing program had strongly stimulated social integration. Mothers of bused children and of children in the receiving schools reported a significantly greater number of interracial friendships than did mothers of other children.[1] Teachers verified these trends which eventuated despite considerable apprehension by the children: "... 24 of the 30 bused children interviewed stated... that the receiving school children were 'friendlier' than expected."[2] In two respects, the impact of busing was restrained: (1) the bused Negro children were of a higher social status than the remainder of the children in the sending schools and thus did not constitute a socially upsetting factor; and, (2) the bused and receiving school children, although friendly in school, did not see much of each other on weekends or during vacations.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 89.

[2] Gladyce H. Bradley, "Friendships Among Students in Desegregated Schools," Journal of Negro Education, Winter, 1964, p. 92.

[3] Bindman, Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University, p. 127.

[4] Ibid., pp. 189-190.

Another study of Berkeley was done by Marascuilo and Levin.[3] They found that the "same" situation was perceived differently by Negro and white students in a newly desegregated school. When students were asked whether members of both races mixed "often" in the school, thirty-eight percent of the whites and forty-six percent of the Negroes said yes. When asked whether mixing occurred "sometimes," the affirmative answers were fifty-one percent and forty-three percent. The researchers note: "... The number of new friends made from the other race is a more important determinant of perceived social mixing than is the race of the perceiver.... Students who had made many friends from other races liked school better, liked their teachers better, and liked their classmates better."[4]

The Teele-Jackson-Mayo study of busing in Boston stated: "with regard to white friends, the [Negro] mothers report that seventy-six percent, eighteen percent, and six percent of their children, respectively, have more, the same, and fewer white friends this year."[1]

---

[1] Jonsson, *Maternal, Teacher and Pupil Attitudes Toward Busing, Integration, and Related Issues in Berkeley Elementary Schools* (Berkeley: Berkeley Unified District, October, 1966), p. 19.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

[3] Leonard A. Marascuilo and Joel R. Levin, "Inter- and Intraracial Group Differences in the Perception of a Social Situation," unpublished paper read at the February, 1966, annual meeting of the American Education Research Association.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 6 and 9.

Gordon studied the educational consequence of joining together students of widely varying social circumstances.[2] In September, 1961, the virtually all-Negro Carver, Michigan, school district was merged, by state direction, into the adjacent Oak Park district, an upper-middle class white suburb of Detroit. The percentage distribution of father's occupation of the merged student body was as follows:[3]

	Negro	White
Professional or Proprietor	3	46
Skilled	26	48
Unskilled	66	3
No Response	5	2

(On the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Oak Park fourth graders were at the 94th percentile, Carver students, at the 9th.)

Gordon found that Negro students participated less than whites in extra-curricular activities and held office less frequently. Athletic activities were the great exception; Negroes, in fact, joined non-academic school clubs at a ratio of about eight to one, while whites joined at about one to one.[4] As for Negro-white social contacts, many more incidents arose between Negro and white girls than between boys. Apparently, one of the basic reasons for these tensions was economic and psychological; white girls were able to afford more expensive and contemporary clothing and this aroused resentment. Lipton's finding was in his integrated school in Hartsdale, New York.[1]

---

[1] Teele, Jackson and Mayo, "Family Experiences in Operation Exodus," p. 305.

[2] Leonard Gordon, An Acculturation Analysis of Negro and White High School Students: The Effects on Social and Academic Behavior of Initial Close Interracial Association at the Secondary Level (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-660). See, also, Gordon, "The Carver-Oak Park Merger," Integrated Education, June-July, 1965.

[3] Ibid., p. 98.

[4] Ibid., p. 119.

Contrary to his expectation Gordon found that Negro students did not tend significantly to defer to whites in selecting companions and leaders; a good deal of self-selection occurred. Yet, there was a certain amount of white snobbery that also occurred.[2]

> ... 16 percent of the Negro students indicated that the fellow student they would most like to know falls into the white student category, while among white students only 1 percent indicated a desire to know most a fellow student who is in the Negro student category.

Gordon had predicted significantly more interaction between Negro and Jewish students. This was true only in part; interracial social relations were marginal with all religious groups. There was also much more interracial social contact among boys than girls.

Gordon found, as predicted, that white students would adapt to "those student activities in which Negroes engage and which tend to enhance the self-perception and status of white students."[3] More white students go out for varsity athletics since Negro students came to Oak Park. The formation of a Human Relations Club in 1964-1965 is another example of adaptive behavior by white students. Another, unintended, adaptation is in a cooperative training program instituted in 1963-1964 as a work-study device especially for Negro seniors. When Gordon made his study, he found that whites in the program outnumbered Negroes.

---

1. Aaron Lipton, "Day-to-Day Problems of School Integration," Integrated Education, June-July, 1965, p. 15.
2. Gordon, p. 129.
3. Ibid., p. 165.

The academic achievement levels of white students remain high; a great number still plan to attend college. Negro achievement remains low. Still, some signs indicate a change. In 1962, no Negro graduates entered college; in 1964, six percent did. At Northern High School, a Negro ghetto school in Detroit--which a number of Carver children had attended before coming to Oak Park--only twenty-seven percent of the students planned to enter college at some time; nearly half the Negro students at Oak Park planned similarly.[1]

The expressed self-confidence scores of Negro students dropped. In 1961, ninety-six fourth through eighth graders at Carver Elementary were asked whether they were confident of being able to succeed at Oak Park. Ninety-five percent replied yes. In 1965, Negro students at Oak Park High were asked the same question and seventy-two percent replied yes. Two observations should be made. First, as Gordon stresses, nearly three-quarters of the Negro children actually at Oak Park are still confident of succeeding; this is perhaps a more significant figure than the earlier 95 percent. Second, considering the objective achievement and social status gulf between the two groups of children, a modest drop from ninety-five to seventy-two percent might reflect a necessary and realistic adjustment by the Negro children. Gordon concludes that "lower-class Negro students from Carver performed more adequately than is generally true of lower-class Negro students. The high achieving student culture of Oak Park was clearly a factor in this change."[2]

Throughout his study, Gordon applied the anthropological concept of acculturation as an explanatory framework. A major advantage of this approach is that the desegregation situation is viewed from the interaction of white and Negro rather than simply the effect of an autonomous "situation" on Negro children. Statistical demonstration is not as important in such a study.

---

1. Ibid., p. 194.
2. Ibid., p. 233.

N. Bradley studied the desegregation of seven colleges in Tennessee.[1] Five hundred eighty-three Negro students constituted the very large sample. Nearly half were reported as making satisfactory progress even though the mean score for 275 Negro freshman students was below the twentieth percentile for college-bound students on the ACT.[2] No real discipline problems were reported. No Negroes belonged to white fraternities or sororities; very few were allowed to live in college dormitories. "There is little, if any, open friction, but there is little real social integration," said a professor to Bradley.[3]

Students stated that racial exclusion or discrimination was the single most unsatisfactory feature of their campus life. On the other hand, when they were asked to list the most satisfactory aspect of their college experience, sixty percent referred to factors with racial overtones:[4]

29.6%	Meeting, mixing, understanding, accepting and learning about different races.
17.4%	Being accepted as a person by helpful instructors and/or friendly students.
13.0%	Meeting the challenge of competition, or coping with whites.

While they stated their greatest difficulty was keeping up academically, Bradley reports that "no special institutional services were provided especially for the Negro undergraduates."[5]

---

[1] Nolen E. Bradley, Jr., *The Negro Undergraduate Student: Factors Relative to Performance in Predominantly White State Colleges and Universities in Tennessee* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-12, 606)

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 74.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 104.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 127.

Racial attitudes of kindergartners were the subject of Handler's study.[1] She set up an experimental interracial group of thirty-three children and a control group of twenty-six in a suburban area. Deliberate instruction was aimed at reducing prejudice. Thus, Handler's project went beyond desegregation. Her goal had been to help the children "define persons less in terms of racial features than they had previously done." Both white and Negro children achieved this goal in some measure; children in the control group, however, actually retrogressed. "The white children still equated 'skin color' with cleanliness after all intervening experiences.... /while/ the Negro children as a total group related cleanliness to bathing and not skin."[2]

It is often predicted that peer relations will be impaired when children of different races are also of differing intelligence levels, Kaplan and Matkom studied this matter in a desegregated northern school.[3] Subjects were 284 white and 88 Negro children drawn from grades two through eight. While the white children were predominantly lower-middle class, the Negro children lived in very poor circumstances in a segregated area.

Kaplan and Markom administered sociometric tests to the children. They found that "when Negro and white children of similar sociometric status are compared, the white children tend to have higher intelligence on reading test scores."[4] The researchers suggest that the Negro children's sociometric success, so to speak, demonstrates that "the I. Q. or reading score is not an adequate reflection of the ability of Negro children and that these children may be perceived by others as brighter, and as having more of the valued intellectual and social skills than test scores or classroom achievement shows."[1] A check was made to ensure that the high sociometric choices were not simply the result of Negroes voting for Negroes; this was found not to be the case. All in all, conclude Kaplan and Matkom hopefully: "The classroom atmosphere is not a simple reflection of the white-Negro feeling in the respective communities."[2]

---

[1] June M. Handler, An Attempt to Change Kindergarten Children's Attitudes of Prejudice Toward the Negro (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-2804).

[2] Ibid., p. 146.

[3] Henry K. Kaplan and Anthony J. Matkom, "Peer Status and Intellectual Functioning of Negro School Children," Psychology in the Schools, April, 1967.

[4] Ibid., p. 183.

Chesler and Segal made a comprehensive study of desegregation in Alabama.[3] Their interviewers--all Negro college students--talked, during June-August, 1966, with a total of 217 Negro students who had attended a white junior high or high school in Alabama during the 1965-1966 school year. This number was equal to over forty percent of the entire population of Negro junior and senior high students attending desegregated public schools in Alabama in 1965-1966.[4] A control group of seventy-five Negro students was established; these were persons who lived near a desegregator but who, for one reason or another, had not transferred to the white school. Thirty-nine white teachers who had taught in the desegregated schools were also interviewed.

The desegregators were extremely apprehensive about what reception they would meet in the white school:[5]

> ... Over one-fourth of the Negro students went to school expecting to be beaten or harmed physically.... Another fifty-two percent felt "uneasy" or "worried," but not actually scared.

(These fears were realistic. In Alba, Alabama, where two Negro children had desegregated the town's high school, two separate bomb explosions occurred in January, 1966.)[1] Chesler and Segal summarize the students' actual experience: "Quite clearly, Negro students experienced considerable indifference and rejection, and often physical and emotional brutality, when they entered white schools."[2] Yet, fifteen percent of the desegregators reported "positive reactions" and seventy-four percent said some whites had acted in a friendly way.[3] Nearly half (forty-eight percent) said they belonged to an interracial school club.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 184.

[3] Mark A. Chesler and Phyllis Segal, Characteristics of Negro Students Attending Previously all-white Schools in the Deep South (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, September, 1967).

[4] Ibid., p. 15.

[5] Ibid., p. 28.

Chesler and Segal compared the desegregators with the control group of non-desegregators. There was no significant difference between the educational levels of the two groups of parents. While both groups of students had the same educational aspirations, the desegregators had significantly higher expectations (eighty percent vs. sixty-five percent) of attending college. Most significant for the study, the researchers reported that "desegregators seem to be less negatively prejudiced against whites, and more actively concerned about change and their efforts in change roles."[4] This finding is clearly in line with those of Singer, Haggstrom, and Blake.

Had the desegregators' perceptions of *white students* changed? As the researchers report: "It is clear that before entering the white school Negro youngsters had an unrealistically low estimate of their abilities in relation to white students."[5] But experience is, at times, a great teacher. When desegregators were asked whether, before transferring, they thought white students would be smarter, sixty-three percent said yes. Only twenty-two percent still thought so after desegregation. This was a highly significant change. "It is clear," state Chesler and Segal, "that before entering the white school, Negro youngsters had an

---

1. See Integrated Education, April-May, 1966, p.6.
2. Chesler and Segal, p. 36.
3. Ibid., pp. 31 and 35.
4. Ibid., p. 60.
5. Ibid., p. 80.

unrealistically low estimate of their abilities in relation to white students."

(Incidentally, over three quarters of the desegregators reported that the white students turned out to be noisier and less well-behaved than they had expected.)

Contacts with whites outside class were reported by a majority of desegregators; three-quarters of the group regarded at least some of the white students as friends. Did they trust whites more or less since desegregation? Thirty-seven percent said more but forty-one percent said less.

How had the desegregators fared in academic achievement? No test scores or school records were available, and so self-reports of grades were recorded. Table 5 summarizes the results for desegregators and non-desegregators:[1]

TABLE 5

Self-Report of Change in Grades During Two School Years in Desegregator and Control Population

Change	Desegregators (N = 197)	Control
Grades increased	11.3%	26.6%
Grades remained unchanged	28.2	49.3
Grades declined	60.5	24.0

What appears to have been a disastrous change for the worse is probably the very opposite. As Chesler and Segal report: "Overall, eighty-three percent of the desegregators unequivocally said they gained a lot from being in the white school, and the rest felt they made gains although they had been severely or moderately tempered by sacrifices."[2]

The Chesler-Segal study is rare for its locale, exemplary for its modest aims, and excellent for the rigorous care with which it was carried out. Its findings are rich in implications for desegregation, North and South.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 86.
[2] Ibid., p. 85.

Do Negro children tend to conform to the pressures of white influence when in an interracial learning situation? Janney and associates studied eighty Negro and white children in the Wichita, Kansas, schools. Unexpectedly, they found that Negroes did not conform any more than whites.[1] The researchers explained the outcome as resulting from the integrated nature of the group; most earlier studies had occurred in a segregated context. Mock studied conformity among 280 Negro and white fourth, fifth, and sixth graders in the Berkeley schools in 1965, when these were still largely segregated. Negro children were high conformers, Mock reported:[2]

> The more whites there were in the group, the more the Negroes conformed. The more Negroes in the group, the less the whites conformed.

High credence was given to information derived from the group with greater prestige. "As the balance of relative power and self-esteem between the races alters," Mock comments, "experimental results of quite a different sort could easily be obtained."[3]

In Daytona Beach, Florida, Schneider studied conforming behavior in 192 Negro and white seventh and eighth graders. Subjects were given several experimental tasks to perform under four grouping arrangements. No significant differences in conformance was found between

---

[1] Fred Janney, Sharon Mallory, Richard Rossitto, and John Simon, "Conformity as a Function of Race and Age," Psychological Reports, 25 (1969) 596.

[2] Ronald Lester Mock, The Relationship Among Children Between Conformity and the Racial Composition of Small Quasi-Groups (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1968), pp. 75-76. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-3658).

[3] Ibid., p. 124.

Negro and white groups.[1] White subjects conformed more in the face of unanimous opposition of whites than if the unanimous opposition was voiced by blacks. Negro subjects were not subject to a similar ethnic effect. A good deal of interracial antagonism existed within the school; on social distance tests, Negro children were considerably more accepting than white children. Schneider observed: "... An ominous outlook was reflected in the behavior of the white children. The so-called white racism of America was evident in the white children's hostile attitudes toward Negroes and in their disrespect for their Negro peers as sources of influence."[2] Yet, "the Negro children did not buckle under to the influence of their white peers."[3] This finding contradicted the findings by I. Katz--discussed below, p.218, as applied to college students. One difference between the two studies is that black and white were face-to-face in the Katz experiment while this was not quite the case in the Schneider study. An additional difference is that Schneider failed to find that Negro children became more anxious after experiencing opposition of white peers.[4]

A related investigation was conducted by O'Connor in two desegregated schools in Gainsville, Florida. He studied the degree to which Negro and white children, seven years old and in first grade, would imitate adult and peer models in two experimental tasks. Negro children, he found did not imitate white peer models more than they imitated Negro peer models. Rather, they imitated Negro peer models more than white children imitated white peer models.[1] Thus, once more conformity was found not to be especially salient among Negro children.

---

[1] Frank Wheeler Schneider, Differences Between Negro and White School Children in Conforming Behavior (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1968), p.30 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-17, 040).

[2] Ibid., pp. 55-56.

[3] Ibid., p. 55.

[4] Ibid., p. 46.

Radke and associates studied social relations among Negro and white children in six Pittsburgh schools; the study was published in 1949. Radke speaks of "the overwhelming rejection of Negro by the white children...."[2] In a single integrated Pittsburgh school, "choices of friends are made entirely within own racial group by seventy-five percent of the white children and twenty-one percent of the Negro children... Never in the community and only rarely outside the classroom... do the white children choose Negro children as friends."[3]

Hildebrandt studied 798 Negro and white students in seven schools in Dayton, Ohio; the percentage of Negroes ranged from zero in one school to one hundred in another. The major finding was that Negroes strongly favored integrated schools while whites rejected them.[4] In this crosssectional study, it appeared that the older the Negro child, the more strongly he favored integration; the older the white student, the more he rejected integrated schools.[5]

---

1. Andrew Lewis O'Connor III, The Relationship of Imitation to Intelligence and Scholastic Achievement of Negro and White First Grades Pupils in Integrated Classes (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1967), p. 50. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-13, 023).

2. Radke, Trager, and Davis, "Social Perceptions and Attitudes of Children," p. 377.

3. Marion Radke, Jean Sutherland, and Pearl Rosenberg, "Racial Attitudes of Children," Sociometry, 13 (1950) 164, 166.

4. Charles Au Hildebrandt, The Relationship of Some Personal and Social Variables of School Children to Preference for Mixed Schools (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962), p. 7. (University Microfilms Order No. 63-2503).

5. Ibid., pp. 32, 34, and 35.

The all-Negro school registered the smallest majority support for integration. Both groups of students were asked to gauge the integration sentiments of the groups:[1]

> A large majority of whites conceive of their fellows as preferring an all-white school, while a small majority of Negroes believe that white children prefer a mixed school.... A large majority of whites believe Negroes prefer separate schools while a large majority of Negroes believe that their own group prefers the opposite.

In Oak Ridge, Tennessee, five months of desegregation was accompanied by significantly less antagonistic attitudes toward Negroes on the part of white high school students. The curious thing about this finding is that it held true even for white students still attending a segregated high school.[2]

Koslin and associates studied the effect of integration on interpersonal racial attitudes of 129 Negro and white first and second graders in three schools. One was all-Negro, another all-white, and a third equally divided. A test was constructed in which children pasted decals of different racial figures and drew a school. The major findings were as follows:[3]

> Integrated Negro subjects were significantly closer to white children target figures than were segregated Negroes.... Integration accelerated a tendency for white subjects to move closer to Negro target figures

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[2] Paul Gordon Whitmore, Jr., *A Study of School Desegregation: Attitude Change and Scale Validation* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1956), p. 33. (Universal Microfilms Order No. 20, 501).

[3] Sandra Cohen Koslin, Marianne Amarel, and Nancy Ames, "A Distance Measure of Racial Attitudes in Primary Grade Children: An Exploratory Study," *Psychology in the Schools,* October, 1969, p. 385.

> as grade increased. Regardless of race, integrated subjects were closer to school than segregated subjects.

A second study by Koslin and associates of first and third grade children in four schools in a large eastern city arrived at somewhat different findings. In the years between the two grades, white children continued to prefer all-white surroundings while Negro children changed from a slight preference for whites to a clear preference for Negro teachers and peers.[1] In a third study, involving five schools, all of which enrolled from twenty-five to seventy-five percent Negroes, children tended to prefer peers of their own race. In racially-balanced classrooms--whose enrollment reflected the racial composition of total enrollment in the school--three tests "revealed positive relationships between school racial balance and the favorableness of interracial attitudes, with any possible effects of socioeconomic status controlled."[2]

Roth studied the effects of a black studies curriculum and of integration on fifth grade students in the schools of Pontiac, Michigan. The period covered by the study was September-December, 1968. Roth found that maximum results came from teaching black studies in an integrated setting. Negro children involved in this combination increased their sense of black pride without--as Roth puts it--"a hate whitey" tone.[1]

---

[1] Sandra Cohen Koslin, Bertam L. Koslin, John Cardwell, and Richard Pargament, "A Quasi-disguised and Structured Measure of Schoolchildren's Racial Preferences," paper delivered at annual meeting of the American psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September, 1969, p. 5.

[2] Sandra Cohen Koslin, Bertham L. Koslin, Richard Pargament, and Harvey Waxman, "Effects of School Balance on Racial Attitudes," no date, p. 4.

In Wood's study of Project Concern, in Hartford, Connecticut, it was reported summarily that "urban and suburban children were involved in a socio-educational experiment where mutual acceptance was not a problem and where positive social interaction between white and non-white, deprived and not-so-deprived, was at an extremely high level in both directions."[2]

Pugh conducted one of the earliest studies of Negro students in integrated and segregated schools located in Columbus and Dayton, Ohio. Among his findings were the following:[3]

1. In mixed schools, the students were better adjusted in their home and family relationships than those in separate schools.
2. Negro students in separate schools are apparently less satisfied with their Negro administrators and teachers than are the Negro students in mixed schools with their white administrators and teachers.
3. The group in separate schools showed far better adjustment to the social life of their schools than the Negro groups in mixed schools.
4. There is no significant difference in the degree of race pride of the mixed and the separate school groups.

In cases 1 and 2, the Negro students in the integrated schools had an advantage; in case 3 the advantage lay with the segregated students. In case 4, neither side had an advantage. It would seem warranted to conclude that integration was, on the whole, more beneficial. In a recent study, however, Williams and Cole erroneously represent Pugh's study as indicating "that Negro morale is higher in segregated settings than in an integrated milieu."[1]

---

[1] Rodney W. Roth, "The Effects of 'Black Studies' on Negro Fifth Grade Students," Journal of Negro Education, 38 (1969) 438; see also, Roth, The Effects of Integral Curriculum on Negro and White Fifth Grade Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969), p. 76. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-18,095).

[2] Wood, The Effects of Busing, p.45.

[3] Roderick W. Pugh, "A Comparative Study of the Adjustment of Negro Students in Mixed and Separate High Schools," Journal of Negro Education, 12 (1943) 616.

The effects of desegregation on behavior problems were investigated by Banks and Di Pasquale in Buffalo, New York. Four groups were asked to indicate what they thought the course of behavior problems has been through the first year of desegregation. Here are the findings, by percent:[2]

	Principals	Teachers	Negro Students	White Students
Somewhat lower or significantly lower	13	29	49	16
No change	13	24	34	81
Higher or significantly high	74	47	17	3

The contrast between students, on the one hand, and principals and teachers, on the other, is striking. One wonders whether surveys of "student unrest" have not depended too heavily on responses by administrators and teachers.

---

[1] Robert L. Williams and Spurgeon Cole, "Scholastic Attitudes of Southern Negro Students," Journal of Negro Education, Winter, 1969, p. 75. See also Williams, "Cognitive and Affective Components of Southern Negro Students' Attitude Towards Academic Integration," Journal of Social Psychology, 76 (1968) 107-111.

[2] Ronald Banks and Mary Ellen Di Pasquale, A Study of the Educational Effectiveness of Integration (Buffalo, New York: Buffalo Public Schools, January, 1969), pp. 8, 11, 19, and 21.

Parents were asked how their children's interest in school had been affected by desegregation. The findings were as follows, by percent:[1]

	Negro	White
Improved or greatly improved	60	11
Stayed the same	31	86
Declined or declined a great deal	9	3

These opinions are consonant with the academic realities of the school. On the other hand, McDill and associates have noted the almost universal enthusiasm by parents for experimental programs in general.[2]

In Moorefield's study of Kansas City, it will be recalled, desegregation did not result in improved academic achievement. Some light on that outcome might be shed by an examination of social interaction inside the classroom. Nine out of ten Negro parents stated that "positive relationships" existed between their bused-in children and those in the receiving school.[3] Sociometric data showed, however, that three-quarters of the bused-in Negro children were rated low-acceptance by the children regularly in attendance in the receiving schools.[4] Two-thirds of the bused-in children were regarded as "aggressive" by the regular students.[5] Higher academic self-concept by Negro children resulted from being accepted by the white children.[6]

---

1. Ibid., p. 14.
2. Edward L. McDill, Mary S. McDill, and J. Timothy Sprehe, Strategies for Success in Compensatory Education: An Appraisal of Evaluation Research (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins Press, 1970), pp. 43-44.
3. Moorefield, The Busing of Minority Group Children, p. 78.
4. Ibid., p. 157.
5. Ibid., p. 167.
6. Ibid., p. 166.

Thirty-eight percent of the teachers who taught in classes having bused-in children indicated to Moorefield a "non-acceptance of busing."[1] Few if any teaching adaptations were made in the classroom.

> Thirty of the forty-two teachers... in this study said that having the bused-in children in their rooms did not cause them to alter or adapt their teaching or cause them to do anything in a different way in their teaching methods or techniques.... The other twelve teachers indicated that the principal difference with the presence of the transported-in pupils was that they had to slow down and could not cover as much material as previously.[2]

In assessing the desegregation experience, teachers seemed most concerned about the academic aptitude and achievement of the transported children.

Beecher studied relations among students in two Manhattan junior high schools. On a social distance scale, Puerto Rican children were very highly accepting of Negro students; the latter, in turn, were also--but somewhat less--accepting of the Puerto Ricans.[3] Negro children were considerably more accepting of Italians than of Jews. Skin color was found not to correlate with social acceptance scores between Puerto Rican and Negro; the former tended toward acceptance of light skin, the latter, toward dark skin.[4]

In Rochester, New York, Barber studied the effect of an open-enrollment plan on racial prejudices of children. Negro children transferred to School A, a predominantly white school in the city, and to School C, a predominantly white school in the suburbs. Barber reports:[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 81.

[2] Ibid., p. 192.

[3] Robert Houston Beecher, A Study of Social Distance Among Adolescents of Ethnic Minorities (Doctoral dissertation New York University, 1968), pp. 81-83. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 780).

[4] Ibid., p. 44.

> Testimony from open enrollment Negro students... indicated a universally felt fear or uncertainty during their first few months at School A and a continuing lack of assurance in dealing with a resentful white majority. It may well be these pressures of insecurity and feelings of alienation are at least in part responsible for more distrust of whites and less self-esteem among open enrollment students.

It may be added that Barber's observations were made during the 1966-1967 school year.

White teachers were found to be contributing to the tension:[2]

> Their reactions, as guarded as some of them be, have tended to reinforce the white student's anti-Negro feelings.... The open hostilities exhibited by some teachers at /faculty/ meetings, their lack of tact and their stereotyped, vituperative humor must certainly be communicated to students. At the same time, of course, Negro students at School A find evidence to support their anti-white prejudices because of this kind of negative communication.

Barber added that a majority of teachers and white parents were antagonistic to the desegregation program, preferring to wait until changed housing patterns would permit "natural" desegregation.[3]

In Angleton, Texas, during the first year of high school desegregation, the dropout rate of Negro students rose from 2.3 percent to 7.0 percent while the rate for white students remained unchanged.[1] By implication, Bryant's explanation suggests that the increased rate was accounted for by the pressure of heightened academic competition of white students. (No mention was made of special help for the lagging Negro students.) A constrasting finding was reached by Hunt and Hardt in their study of Negro boys in an Upward Bound program. Increases in test scores of Negroes were significant for those measures "primarily concerned with academic adequacy and self-evaluation--which is somewhat surprising in light of the white superiority in academic achievement."[2]

---

[1] Ralph W. Barber, The Effects of Open Enrollment on Anti-Negro and Anti-White Prejudices Among Junior High School Students in Rochester, New York (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1968), p. 102.

[2] Ibid., p. 104

[3] Ibid., p. 106.

In the South Carolina study by McWhirt, it was found at the end of a year of desegregation that "interracial contact was conducive in bringing about changes in the attitudes of the Negro students in the integrated school.... The highly favorable self-concept rating of the Negro students indicates that they did not submit to self-depreciation in order to gain acceptance from whites."[3] White children did not experience any lessening of anti-Negro prejudice. Bienvenu found in a Florida high school that lack of acceptance by white students as well as academic difficulties helped make desegregation an anxiety-producing experience.[4] In Delaware, Harootunian and Morse found that Negro students in segregated schools had the highest anxiety levels.[5] No simple statement can be made about the effect of desegregation on anxiety. According to Epps, the fact that lower-class children display more anxiety than middle-class children and Negro children generally display more than white children is not at all connected with segregation or desegregation.[1]

---

[1] Bryant, Some Effects of Racial Integration, pp. 101-102.

[2] David E. Hunt and Robert H. Hardt, "The Effect of Upward Bound Programs on the Attitudes, Motivation, and Academic Achievement of Negro Students," Journal of Social Issues, 25 (1969) 126.

[3] Ronald Alfred McWhirt, The Effects of Desegregation on Prejudice, Academic Aspiration, and the Self-Concept of Tenth Grade Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1967), p. 41. (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15,568).

[4] Bienvenu, Effects of School Integration, pp. 64, 67, and 73.

[5] Harootunian and Morse, Characteristics of Negro and White High School Students, p. 92.

Boys in Project A Better Chance (ABC) experienced a very sharp contrast in sociocultural styles. As Wessman points out: "While it would be unfair to characterize the independent schools as citadels of snobbery, it would be unrealistic not to recognize that social status plays a significant role in the recruitment of their clientele."[2] Nevertheless, about three-quarters of the boys made a clearly satisfactory social adjustment. A degree of racial conflict occurred: "Over half... felt that they had encountered some degree of prejudice in the school, and ... a third... felt the incidents were serious and upsetting."[3] The program was largely successful over the two years, but there developed among many participants an "increased level of tension, worry, and driveness."[4] But, adds Wessman, "one cannot aspire without facing the threat of the frustration of aspiration."[5]

Hall and Gentry reviewed the social interaction of 377 Negro high school students in desegregated schools. In general boys interacted much more with their white peers than did girls with theirs. Participation in extracurricular activities was reported by 58.3 percent of the students in their first year, 71 percent the second year and 100 percent in the fourth year.[6] Interracial activities that involved

---

1. Edgar G. Epps, "Interpersonal Relations and Motivation: Implications for Teachers of Disadvantaged Children," Journal of Negro Education, 39 (1970) 15.
2. Wessman, Evaluation of Project ABC, p. 116.
3. Ibid., p. 144.
4. Ibid., p. 193.
5. Ibid., p. 196.
6. Morrill M. Hall and Harold W. Gentry, "Isolation of Negro Students in Integrated Public Schools," Journal of Negro Education, Spring, 1969, p. 158.

formal rather than informal interaction were most readily engaged in--club meetings, rather than dances.

Meyers studied a highly selected sample of 327 Negro students attending fifteen predominantly white high schools throughout the country. Altogether, the Negro students made up 2.2 percent of enrollment. School climate, Meyers found, was significantly related to educational aspirations and achievement for both Negro and white, but less so for the former.[1] The Negro student is *in* the school but not completely a part *of* it. As Meyers states: "... Racial integration is a necessary but not sufficient condition for social integration of a minority group.... It is quite possible that the Negro youth who stars in a football game may be excluded from the victory celebration that night...."[2] Yet, the Negro student's self-esteem remains high in these very same schools. Esteem has meaning only as a comparative concept: one feels *as* good or better *than* or less *than*. With whom is the Negro student comparing himself?

Meyers replies: "Given the white educational setting, Negro self-esteem is based upon blackness."[3] Though surrounded by whites, he maintains his black identity by referring his sense of self-awareness to his Negro roots. This somewhat puzzling feat is made more intelligible when we examine the Negro student's actual patterns of social interaction in the tokenly desegregated schools. Meyers found "the existence of subsocieties... *delimited by racial identity* within the social system of the high school."[4] The Negro student and his Negro peers are thrown together with the result that they act to reinforce each other's already high aspirations. For these Negro students, peer influence is more important than climate effect; the reverse is the case for white students in that same school.

---

[1] Edmund Dean Meyers, Jr., *Effects of Social and Educational Climate of High Schools Upon the Academic Performance of Negro and White Adolescents* (Doctoral dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1967), p. 200. (University Microfilms Order No. 67-13,817).

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 284 (emphasis in original).

The Office of Civil Rights, HEW study, conducted during spring, 1969 in five southern states, reported that extracurricular activities were open to all in the desegregated schools but that "Negro students often indicated their resentment at losing their leadership positions on transferring to the formerly-white school."[1] Further, the OCR study noted: "Negro students reported considerable insecurity concerning social activities at the desegregated schools.... In most of the high schools visited, it was noted by black and white students that the races tended to be separate in the cafeterias, assembly halls, on the school ground, even in classes where seating was optional."[2] Where numbers of Negro students were fairly large, they experienced less insecurity. Where white students were a minority in formerly all-black schools, they exhibited the same "minority" characteristics.[3]

McDowell studied the willingness of 582 Negro youths, aged sixteen to nineteen, in the District of Columbia to associate with whites. As a whole, they expressed a very high readiness to do so.[4] The eighty percent who were attending schools were more willing than were the twenty percent who had dropped out of school. McDowell found: "The degree of voluntary, informal associations that Negro youth have had with their white fellow students is the one variable that we have examined whose influence on willingness to associate is both strong, unambiguous, and statistically reliable. This is true with regard to social contacts in school but even more so with regard to social contacts out of school."[1] To the researcher, informality of social contact signalled interaction on a more human level. "Without these voluntary, informal dealings," noted McDowell, "in-school contacts are a ritual, a temporary fiction in which both Negro and white participants concur, until they depart the confines of the school building for the 'real life' outside."[2]

---

[1] O.C.R., HEW, "Much Better Than They Expected, p. 47.

[2] Ibid., p. 48.

[3] On this general phenomenon, see Warren David Ten Houten, Socialization, Race and the American High School (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965), esp. p. 429. (University Microfilms Order No. 66-444).

[4] Sophia Fagin McDowell, The Willingness of Negro Youths to Associate with Whites (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1967), p.27.

Fewer than a third of the boys had attended a predominantly white school or one with equal numbers of whites and blacks. Many fewer had experienced informal social contacts with white boys. It was precisely these Negro students who seemed especially prepared for more extensive contacts in other areas of social life.[3]

What criterion did Negro boys employ in selecting whites with whom they sought to socialize? "By far the most frequent criterion in judging whites," according to McDowell, "is how those whites judge Negroes."[4] She explained that in any stratification system a social subordinate generally pays "close attention to the clues of his superior."[5] In the studies of conforming behavior that were reviewed earlier in this chapter, this factor of superordination and subordination was critical. If its force was overcome, it was far from a mere accident. This same inequality of status, McDowell notes, precludes, strictly speaking, emergence of Negro _prejudice_.

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 82.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 72.

[3] See, also, Daniel U. Levine and Norman S. Fiddmont, "Integration Is Up to Date in Kansas City," _Integrated Education_, 7 (1969) 3-16.

[4] _Ibid._, p. 93.

[5] _Ibid._, p. 114.

The Negro is ordinarily not in a position to enforce his ethnic antipathies nor is he accustomed to initiate exclusion. McDowell stresses that "interracial contact is not rejected per se /by Negroes/, but when it involves a greater risk of non-acceptance by whites."[1]

One is reminded of Morland's point that social interaction between Negro and white in racist America will become more humanizing when notions of racial superordination and subordination disappear.

McDowell's research is significant for its sensitivity to the quality of social interaction and for its awareness of status factors in interracial relations.

Of methodological interest is research by Briggs in Alabama. She studied the degree of success Negro students experienced in high school in developing a written language closer to standard English. Between ninth and eleventh grades in boys' writing, for example, there was an overall decrease of spelling vocabulary, verb, and syntactic errors.[2] Girls made more errors at the end of the two year period. This study was done in all-Negro schools. If the locus had been a desegregated school, it is likely that changes in the boys' writing would have been attributed to their greater propensity to interact with their white peers and thus to unlearn "Negro dialect." This underscores the need to attempt control of as many variables as possible.

Several studies have been made recently of social interaction at the college level. In some of these the number of Negro students is so small that interracial contacts affect a very slender fraction of the student bodies. A study of the University of Alabama reported fewer than one percent of the

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 117.

[2] Delores Griffin Briggs, *Deviations from Standard English in Papers of Selected Alabama Negro High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1968), pp. 128, 129, 133, and 143. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-6528).

4

students were Negroes; at a north Georgia college, ten out of 3,000 were Negroes; and at a third--possibly Clemson University--only one percent were Negroes.[1] Nevertheless, between 1963 and 1966 at the University of Alabama there was a highly significant growth of pro-integration sentiment among white students. Muir and McGlamery observed "that those who best knew a Negro playmate /at an earlier age/ would be most favorable to integration... came as somewhat of a surprise since this relationship is supposedly part of the Old South culture."[2] They also discovered that pro-integrationists tended to underestimate the strength of their viewpoint on campus. In view of this, the researchers concluded, "it is reasonable to expect not only the gradual liberalization of attitudes reported above, but dramatic changes as situations develop which invite fuller disclosure of one's opinions."[3]

Between the freshman and senior year, attitudes toward Negroes underwent a statistically significant liberalization among white students at a southern university, possibly Clemson.[4] At the northern Georgia college, Cole and associates found no significant change; recall that there were ten Negro students out of a total of 3,000.

---

[1] See Donald E. Muir and C. Donald McGlamery, "The Evolution of Desegregation Attitudes of Southern University Students," Phylon, 29 (1968), 105-117; Spurgeon Cole, Jay Steinberg, and G. J. Burkheimer, "Prejudice and Conservatism in a Recently Integrated Southern College," Psychological Reports, 23 (1968), 149-150; and Bernard Caffrey, Simms Anderson II, and Janet Garrison, "Change in Racial Attitudes of White Southerners After Exposure to the Atmosphere of a Southern University," Psychological Reports, 25 (1969) 555-558.

[2] Muir and McGlamery, pp. 111-112.

[3] Ibid., p. 112. See also Ruth C. Shaffer and Albert Schaffer, "Socialization and the Development of Attitudes Toward Negroes in Alabama," Phylon, 27 (1966) 274-285.

[4] Caffrey and others, p. 557.

At Millikin University, in Decatur, Illinois, Forbes and Gipson compared samples of twenty Negroes with thirty-five white students. The Negro students, researchers found, "were more accepting of opposing political viewpoints, were lower in anxiety and were no more dogmatic than white students.... :[1] Markley studied the effects on white students at Northwestern University and Oberlin College of having a Negro roommate. The researchers uncovered an interesting sidelight at Northwestern University which followed a policy of not assigning a Negro roommate to a white whose home address was in the South.[2] Procedural problems of the sample prevented definitive conclusions from being drawn. Informal indications were, however, that the experience had not greatly affected the white students. Hader's attempt to study a related problem was also stopped short by procedural problems.[3]

One especially disturbing feature of interracial relations on a number of college campuses was the unprovoked use of force by white students against black students. Examples may be found at Northwestern University[4] and Wisconsin State University at Oshkosh.[5] In some cases, university officials either ignored the violence or were dilatory in dealing with it.

Pierce has explored deeply the problems Negro

---

1. Gordon B. Forbes and Marilyn Gipson, "Political Attitudes and Opinions, Need for Social Approval. Dogmatism and Anxiety in Negro and White College Students," Journal of Negro Education, Winter, 1969, p. 63.

2. Oliver Wendell Markley, Having a Negro Roommate As An Experience in Intercultural Education (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1968), p. 15. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-1890).

3. R. J. Hader, "Random Roommate Pairings of Negro and White Students," American Statistician, 21 (1967) 26.

4. "Black and White at Northwestern University," Integrated Education, 6 (1968) 34.

5. Paul Abrahams, "Black Thursday at Oshkosh," Crisis, 76 (1969) 373.

adolescents meet in a fully integrated society. Writ small these are also the problems of an integrated school. Under segregation, the Negro youngster has an "umbrella defense" against failure--i.e., the white man prevented further progress. Pierce, a psychiatrist, suggests.

> With the rapid burgeoning of opportunities for Negroes, this formula will no longer suffice.... When the Negro teenager can no longer 'cry race' then the twins of dissatisfaction and anxiety, along with their entourage, may mobilize to a degree heretofore unknown.[1]

Many years ago, the sociologist, W. I. Thomas, wrote that "... no Negro... in America, at least, has ever been fully in the white man's world."[2] Pierce notes that that world is being opened more and more to the Negro adolescent:[3]

> In this situation the incessant burden is on him to prove himself to the satisfaction of the majority. The converse does not hold. The drain on the psychic economy can be of a quality and quantity that the person has never experienced in a lifetime in a segregated school and segregated community. Thus the Negro adolescent who has the possibility of moving up must be prepared for a "culture shock."

---

[1] Chester M. Pierce, "Problems of the Negro Adolescent in the Next Decade," Minority Group Adolescents in the United States, ed. by Eugene B. Brody, (Baltimore, Maryland: Williams and Wilkins, 1968), p. 22.

[2] W. I. Thomas, "Race Psychology: Standpoint and Questionnaire, with Particular Reference to the Immigrant and the Negro," American Journal of Sociology, 17 (1911-1912) 747.

[3] Pierce, "Problems of the Negro Adolescent," p.25.

The school must provide him with hope. As Pierce specifies: "Two areas where hope plus 'reality expectation' can be supplied are (1) in preparing Negro youth for transition to a more tolerant society and (2) in preparing Negro youth to interact with whites and vice versa."[1] The schools of urban America are plentifully supplied with candidates for hope.[2]

2. STUDENT AND TEACHER

Gottlieb studied inner city Negro and white teachers' views of their students.[3] All teachers were given a checklist with a number of character traits of students and were asked to check those that applied to the students (all of whom were Negro). White teachers tended to see the Negro child as highstrung, impetuous, lazy, moody, rebellious, and talkative. Negro teachers, on the other hand, viewed students as ambitious, cooperative, energetic, fun-loving, and happy. These characterizations are based on the items below (Table 6) on which there is a fifteen percent or higher difference between Negro and white teachers.[4]

---

1. Ibid., p. 42.

2. See, for example, Robert W. Heath and Larnders Roy (eds.). Interviews with Seven Black High School Students (Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, December 1969).

3. David Gottlieb, "Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers," August, 1963. Later published in Sociology of Education, Summer, 1964.

4. Ibid., p. 15.

TABLE 6

Teachers' Race and Student Perceptions

Traits	White (%)	Negro (%)
Ambitious	20	36
Cooperative	35	61
Energetic	33	48
Fun loving	45	74
Happy	31	65
Highstrung	39	3
Impetuous	33	13
Lazy	53	19
Middle-brow	4	19
Moody	33	13
Rebellious	35	13
Talkative	59	6

Clearly, the two groups of teachers differ greatly in oreintation toward their students. A great disparity in orientation is also evident in Table 7.[1]

TABLE 7

Teachers' Race and Reasons for Job Dissatisfaction

Reasons	White % of Total Responses	Negro % of Total Responses
Inadequate materials and poor facilities	6	33
Crowded classrooms	13	38
Lack of parental interest	25	6
Behavior-discipline problems	46	19
Others	10	4
	100	100

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

All in all, the Negro teacher sees the major obstacles in the physical supplies and facilities, whereas the white teachers stress shortcomings in the students and their parents. White teachers tended to be pessimistic about the educational future of the children. But, holds Gottlieb, "the Negro teachers are less pessimistic in the evaluations of students since many of the teachers themselves have come from backgrounds similar to that of their students yet managed to overcome social barriers and attain positions of responsibility and status.[1] A question could be raised as to the applicability of these findings to the desegregated school. White teachers who carried their attitudes into the desegregated school would create a special handicap for Negro children. On the other hand, the presence of Negro teachers would be important.

In the preceding chapter we noted Gottlieb's research on the need to create truly integrated schools rather than interracial schools in which Negro and white students simply co-existed.

Wey and Corey reported on desegregation problems and progress in seventy desegregated school districts.[2] Some white teachers were found to have certain difficulties in desegregation. For example, the researchers pointed out that "white teachers who usually knew names of new white pupils within a week found it difficult to identify Negro pupils and call them by name unless the Negroes were placed by seating charts."[3]

In Chapter II, we examined Bindman's findings on Negro student achievement at the University of Illinois. He found that poorly prepared Negro students were reluctant to face their need for special help and so tended not to seek it. This tendency was furthered by the students' general feeling of social isolation on the campus. While some staff members

---

[1] Ibid., p. 17.

[2] Herbert W. Wey and John Corey, Action Patterns in School Desegregation. A Guidebook (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1959).

[3] Ibid., p. 226.

"perform their duties in an openly discriminatory manner,"[1] the Negro student, Bindman continues, "is often surprised at the 'good treatment' he receives from faculty and administrators and... in only a few cases perceives faculty members as hostile to him."[2]

In Lockwood's study, reported in Chapter II, it was found that Negro students in the two racially-balanced schools considered classroom participation significantly more important than did Negro children in five imbalanced schools. Yet, they personally did not participate in classroom activities any more than children in the latter schools.[3]

Gilliland studied certain aspects of Negro learning in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, High School.[4] Negro students constitute six percent of enrollment (111 out of 1,800) at what Gilliland describes as "a large, competitive and academically oriented high school." He was concerned with the problem we have seen in Chapter II--the tendency of Negro students in a desegregated school to soft-pedal academic interests and overstress athletics and other non-academic pursuits. The researcher attempted to change these attitudes by use of small group counselling. Thirty Negro students were assigned to four small groups; sessions continued over a year. A control group was set up.

At the end of the year, "experimental groups excelled the control groups on all measures of scholastic endeavor plus all personal scales and inventories except the Index of Adjustment and Values Test."[5]

---

[1] Bindman, Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University, p. 193.

[2] Ibid., p. 180

[3] Lockwood, An Examination of Scholastic Achievements, Attitudes, and Home Background, p. 53.

[4] Burt E. Gilliland, An Evaluation of the Effects of Small Group Counseling with Negro Adolescents (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966). (University Microfilms Order No. 67-1364).

[5] Ibid., p. 73.

Both the students' educational promise and personal potential has benefited. "Although the expressive actions of Negro adolescents portrayed predominantly non-cognitive, blustery, physical patterns of behavior," concluded Gilliland, "there emerged a manifest desire for successful scholastic achievement which had been carefully masked by overt activities."[1]

In the Chesler-Segal study of Alabama, discussed earlier in this chapter, the role of teachers was examined in two respects: (1) its relation to classroom atmosphere, and (2) its expectancy or non-expectancy of achievement by the Negro desegregators. While three-quarters of the desegregators regarded their white teachers as fair minded, most teachers permitted white students to establish the tone of the classroom. This laissez-faire attitude of the teachers increased tensions. Where teachers were seen as fair minded, the white students in the classroom were generally also so regarded. Thus, the classroom atmosphere pretty well reflected the leadership (or lack of it) shown by teachers.

Some teachers were cruel to the Negro students: "About one third of the descriptions of unfair behavior identified teachers who called students 'nigger,' or had... mispronounced 'Negro.' More than another third of such unfair reports noted that students felt they were singled out by their teachers or mistreated...."[2]

Teachers at first underestimated the academic ability of the Negro students: "Only 75% of the teachers reported that before the desegregators entered their classes they did not think the Negro students would be as smart as the white students. By the end of the year or two of desegregation, however, half of that 75% had changed their minds...."[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 79.

[2] Chesler and Segal, Characteristics of Negro Students Attending Previously All-White Schools in the Deep South, p. 42.

[3] Ibid., p. 78.

Desegregation was an important experience of discovery by many people. Many desegregators found they could do as well as white students; many teachers increased their respect for Negro abilities. (One wonders how the white students felt about all this; but, unfortunately, the Chesler-Segal team was unable to interview them.)

Boney reports on Negro social style on white campuses.[1] Reporting from a northern university, Boney observes: "... Non-white students tend to assign a disproportionate amount of importance to the evaluations of whites with reference to their role expectations. Docile and submissive behaviors in racially integrated learning situations are expected and rewarded by many white teachers."[2]

In virtually none of the above studies of desegregation is there any indication that special teaching or curricular adaptations were made. When Baltimore's schools underwent their initial desegregation in 1955, for example, the school administration held that "special 'preparation' of teachers for integrated schools was unnecessary, and would probably do more harm than good by calling attention to differences when teachers should think of likenesses."[3] Such a view was wholly consistent with common sense and, since virtually no large-scale desegregation projects had occurred anywhere to show otherwise, very possibly correct. Since then, however, a good deal of experience had been accumulated. Repeated studies have shown the importance of deliberate classroom changes that are required for effective desegregation. In Chapter II, Gottlieb was cited on this point. Later in the present chapter, we shall cite Katz; and in Chapter 7, Pettigrew.

---

[1] J. Don Boney, "Some Dynamics of Disadvantaged Students in Learning Situations," Journal of Negro Education, Summer, 1967.

[2] Ibid., pp. 318-319.

[3] Elinor Pancoast, The Report of a Study on Desegregation in the Baltimore City Schools (Baltimore: Maryland Commission on Interracial Problems and Relations, 1956), p. 103.

If, as was demonstrated in Chapter II, greater learning occurs in desegregated than segregated schools and classrooms, then why are any further preparations needed? In the same Baltimore report just quoted, the following statement appears: "There can be no doubt that many [teachers] in their hearts prefer segregation and regret the new policy of interracial schools."[1] This is a prime reason for taking special measures as part of a desegregation program. As Chesler puts it, we cannot depend on "doing what come naturally": "Too much of what is natural in American race relations is distrustful and separatist; desegregation itself is a departure from our natural social patterns, and other breaks with tradition are vital."[2]

Yet, Blake cautions against assuming that desegregation increases the number of disadvantaged children and thus occasions the training of teachers to deal with this additional disadvantage.[3] He states:[4]

> When schools are desegregated, there is not an increase in the number of disadvantaged children. They may [now] be distributed in different schools but that does not automatically mean that the teachers in these schools are ill-equipped to teach them.

Blake urges that different kinds of measures need to be taken to improve "education in biracial settings."[5] If teachers in a desegregated school are not competent to teach, both Blake and Chesler say, they should be trained further: "Only teachers in a desegregated school who are incompetent to teach the disadvantaged need the additional training."[1] (Blake); "The teacher who is a skilled and fully competent professional has a good start on being successful in an interracial situation."[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 102.

[2] Mark A. Chesler, *Teacher Training Designs for Improving Instruction in Interracial Classrooms*, unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-17, 1967.

[3] Elias Blake, Jr., *A Re-Definition of Educational Problems Occasioned by Desegregation and Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964*, unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967.

[4] *Ibid.*, p.8.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

A small-scale example of teacher preparation for desegregation rather than disadvantage is described by Zinberg.[3] Teachers from Arlington, Massachusetts, a white middle-class suburb of Boston, met with teachers from an all-Negro Roxbury school in groups of sixteen, for two sessions of one and three quarter hours' length. A psychiatrist led the group discussions. The aim was to learn what to expect when the Arlington schools would receive some Negro children from Boston. Although the time was minimal, apparently the Arlington teachers came nearer to comprehending the human hurt of segregation and discrimination. Zinberg concluded:[4]

> ... The problem to be faced by the teacher who chooses to participate in this social change is clearly a larger one than simply presiding over integrated classes in such a way that no unpleasant incidents occur. He must work with deeper hurt feelings from past difficulties and with the prejudices that exist by the time children reach his classroom.

Zinberg makes clear the need of the teacher to face up to his own prejudices.

In discussions of school desegregation, sooner or later the issues of academic standards arises. We have seen that desegregation and rising academic achievement are quite compatible. We have also seen, however, that teachers will sometimes set low academic standards for Negro children. An academic standard is essentially a matter of the teacher's expectations. In the Chesler-Segal study we saw how teachers had pitched their expectations of performance of Negro students much too low. The connection between teacher expectations and student performance has been illuminated dramatically by Rosenthal.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 9.

[2] Chesler, "Teacher Training Designs for Improving Instruction in Interracial Classrooms," p.3.

[3] Norman E. Zinberg, "A Group Approach With the Integration Crisis," Mental Hygiene (April, 1967).

[4] Ibid., pp. 297-298.

During Spring, 1964, some children in the first two grades of a west coast elementary school were designated part of an experimental group, others part of a control group. Both groups of children remained in the same room. Teachers were given names of one fifth of the children who, according to the experimenters, were especially capable and were "earmarked for intellectual growth"; these made up the experimental group. The remaining children were designated as ordinary and constituted the control group.

In fact, however, the experimental children were no brighter. The only difference between the two groups, as Rosenthal states, "was in the mind of the teacher,"[2] I.Q. tests were administered at the beginning and at the end of the experimental period. While nearly one fifth of the control children gained twenty or more I.Q. points, two-and-one-half times that number (forty-seven percent) in the experimental group made the same gain.[3] "... The children from whom intellectual growth was expected," reported Rosenthal,"became more intellectually alive and autonomous or at least were so perceived by their teachers."[4] Curiously, when selected control children developed

---

[1] Robert Rosenthal, "Changing Children's I.Q. by Changing Teachers' Expectations," unpublished paper read before the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, September 2, 1966.

[2] Ibid., p. 5.

[3] Ibid., p.7.

[4] Ibid., p. 8.

"unexpectedly," they seemed to show undesirable behavior as well, or at least were so perceived by the teacher. Teachers continued to play favorites even within the experimental group. Children in the lowest track, even though they scored relatively as high as other experimental children in relation to the control group, were nevertheless ranked less favorably than upper-track children by teachers.

Another issue considered by Rosenthal is of special relevance to desegregation. He rejected the "Robbing Peter to Pay Paul" hypothesis. This formulation describes a classroom situation in which the learning gains of some students were won at the expense of other students. But in Rosenthal's experiment this did not happen. Instead, "the greater the gain made by the children of whom gain was expected, the greater the gain made in the same classroom by those children from whom no special gain was expected."[1] It would be fascinating to study in those Alabama classrooms the precise effect on achievement of changing teacher expectations. (See comments on the Chesler-Segal study, above.)

Rosenthal concludes hopefully:[2]

> It may be that as teacher training institutions acquaint teachers to be with the possibility that their expectations of their pupils' performance may serve as self-fulfilling prophecies, these teacher trainees may be given a new expectancy--that children can learn more than they believed possible.

This conclusion is highly consistent with an empirical conclusion by Gordon and Wilkerson on the education of disadvantaged children.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 11.

[2] Ibid., p. 14.

[3] See Edmund W. Gordon and Doxey A. Wilkerson, "Critique of Compensatory Education," in Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966).

Amos studied ninth graders in three integrated schools in Flint, Michigan. Both Negro and white students felt rejected by their teachers although the white students thought their Negro classmates were being accepted.[1] Amos reported a difference between the expressed attitudes of the teachers toward Negro students and the way the Negro students perceived their teachers' behavior.

Edwards analyzed the records of a series of seminars conducted by teachers of disadvantaged children. It was hoped that they might thus become better teachers by developing better attitudes; panels met from fifteen to twenty times. Edwards reported that: (1) the panels were never clear as to their goals; (2) "most of the conversation seemed superficial and at times banal"[2] and (3) successful teachers were not those with the "best" attitudes but those who had worked out classroom techniques and procedures that are successful in the sense of keeping teacher and students, hence administrators and parents, reasonably content with the classroom situation."[3]

Wilcox has suggested that the ghetto system of school and community life creates the groundwork for not educating the children of the ghetto: "... Teachers can legitimately fail to teach and students can legitimately fail to learn. The non-achievement of the student has no bearing on the professional fortunes of the teachers; the non-achievement of the students is viewed as a mere fulfillment of the self-fulfillment prophecy."[4] A more recent declaration has made

---

1. Robert T. Amos, "The Accuracy of Negro and White Children's Predictions of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Negro Students," Journal of Negro Education, 21 (1952) 134.

2. T. Bentley Edwards, "Teacher Attitudes and Cultural Differentiation," Journal of Experimental Education, Winter, 1966, p. 85.

3. Ibid.

5. Preston R. Wilcox, "Teacher Attitudes and Student Achievement," Teachers College Record, 68 (1966-1967) 374.

a similar point: "By and large, the [school] system has expected the [inner city] student to be a failure, and unaware of its failure, has succeeded in creating the student in its own image."[1]

Empirical tests of the above view are not very numerous and no full test of it has yet been made. Following, however, are highlights of a series of studies that have been reported.

Helton reviewed the experience of about three hundred Negro graduate students in five predominantly white Tennessee state colleges. Academically, they did quite well; they participated widely in extracurricular activities. "Twenty-eight percent," according to Helton, "were very sensitive to the prejudice shown by some of their instructors." At another point, Helton referred to "the underlying but unmentioned fact that many faculty members are biased and prejudiced toward the Negro graduate student."[2]

In a desegregated junior high school in Virginia, Datta found that teachers regarded low-achieving Negro students as hostile outsiders while high-achieving Negro children were described as favorably as high-scoring white children. Datta called for programs "to develop teacher understanding and acceptance of groups of pupils who now are likely to experience rejection in the classroom."[3] Rosenhan conducted an experiment with seventy-two first graders in Trenton, New Jersey; twenty-four were middle-class whites and forty-eight lower class Negroes and whites.

---

[1] Urban Education Task Force, "Report on Urban Education," *Congressional Record*, January 20, 1970, E 52.

[2] Helton, *Characteristics, Performance, Problems, and Successes of Negro Graduate Students*, pp. 85 and 104.

[3] Lois-ellin Datta, Earl Schaefer, and Malcom Davis, *Sex and Scholastic Aptitude as Variables in Teachers' Ratings of the Adjustment and Classroom Behavior of Negro and Other Seventh Grade Students*, 1966, p. 20. (ERIC # ED 028 206). See also *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 59 (1968) 94-101.

He hypothesized: "If lower class children are more alienated in a middle class institution, they should be more responsive to praise than middle class children would be. By the same token, the performance of lower class children should be more disrupted by disapproval than that of their middle class peers."[1] The hypothesis was supported. Lower class learning was heavily influenced by praise or disapproval. Class was found to be far more important than race.

Harris' study of Negro and white children in eighteen substantially segregated schools, found that teachers of the two racial groups had different standards of grading. Teachers of the white children tended to base grades on actual achievement; teachers of the Negro children used some other, undetermined base.[2] North and Buchanan investigated teacher attitudes toward poverty-area children in Phoenix, Arizona. In general, teachers approached the children in terms of a negativistic stereotype.[3] This was somewhat less true of Negro teachers than of white ones. In her study in Elkhart, Indiana, Bartel reported that "a teacher's perception of a child's social class is significantly more related to the child's achievement than is his actual social class.... To be perceived by a teacher as lower class attenuates a child's chances of being a good achiever."[4]

---

1. Daniel L. Rosenhan, "Effects of Social Class and Race on Responsiveness to Approval and Disapproval," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4 (1966) 254.

2. Gary Reeves Harris, A Study of the Academic Achievement of Selected Negro and White Fifth-Grade Pupils When Educational Ability is Held Constant (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1967), p. 62. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-6738).

3. George E. North and O. Lee Buchanan, "Teacher Views of Poverty Area Children," Journal of Educational Research, October, 1967, p. 55.

4. Bartel, Locus of Control and Achievement in Middle Class and Lower Class Children, pp.77 and 78.

A number of years ago in Chicago, Beckham studied, among other things, white teacher prejudice against Negro students. Interviewing 250 non-delinquent high school boys, 100 delinquent boys, and 100 adults, he asked whether they personally had found white teachers prejudiced against Negroes. They responded as follows, by percentage:[1]

	Non-delinquents	Delinquents	Adults
Many	9.5	27.2	40
Few	42.8	4.5	40
None	44.4	68.1	20
No Reply	3.1		
	99.8	99.8	100

In Chapel Hill, North Carolina, Ellis and Wiggins found that teachers of Negro children in a bi-racial classroom were reported by the children as tending to ignore their good achievement.[2] Both teachers and parents tended to expect lower achievement than actually occurred.[3]

Lenkowsky and Blackman presented seventy-two education graduate students--all of whom had had some teaching experience--with a description of hypothetical retardates, lower-and upper-class, Negro and white. The subjects exhibited a bias against the lower-class child but were unaffected by race.[4]

---

[1] Albert Sidney Beckham, "A Study of Race Attitudes in Negro Children of Adolescent Age," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 29 (1934-1935) 25.

[2] Ellis and Wiggins, Cooperation, Aggression and Learning in a Bi-racial Classroom, p.54.

[3] Ibid., p. 79.

[4] Ronald S. Lenkowsky and Leonard S. Blackman, "The Effect of Teachers' Knowledge of Race and Social Class on their Judgments of Children's Academic Competence and Social Acceptability," Mental Retardation, 6 (1968) 17.

Zamoff studied teacher attitudes toward desegregation and academic achievement in "Mill City," twelve percent of whose population was Negro. A widespread evasiveness was found among teachers when asked to discuss various topics. While many acknowledged that Negro children might be "shortchanged" in predominantly black schools, more than two-thirds of the teachers could not name a single school in town in which such shortchanging occurred.[1] Teachers tended to avoid discussions of segregation and desegregation. In reply to a question of why Negro children achieved so little in schools, only 7.1 percent of the responses attributed at least some of the responsibility to the school.[2] Teachers were very poorly informed on the general topic of desegregation.

A nationwide survey of student unrest in 140 high schools in 52 cities reported: "Teachers in the Survey for the most part felt threatened by student unrest. By a ratio of two to one, teachers were hostile toward protesting students."[3] Students had placed the issue of "institutional racism" first on their lists of complaints. Among their first four demands three dealt directly with measures designed to reduce racial inequities."[4]

Increases in achievement by Negro children who have recently entered desegregated schools are sometimes obscured by a simultaneous change in comparison standards by teachers. Denmark and associates comment in their study of Manhasset, Long Island: "It appears that the teachers set higher comparison levels to evaluate Negro children after integration than the ones used the previous year--and actual improvement is hidden. Teachers should be alerted to these tendencies and trained to avoid the problems they create."[1]

---

[1] Richard Bruce Zamoff, Elementary School Teachers as a Source of Support for or Resistance to a Program of Quality Desegregated Public Education (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1968), p. 71. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-683).

[2] Ibid., p. 75.

[3] Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice, Report of the ... Student Unrest Survey (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Justice, September, 1969), p.3.

[4] On teachers and racism, see letter by Benjamin Solomon, Harvard Educational Review, 39 (1969) 164-167

In Oakland, California, Webster and Lund studied patterns of teacher mobility in a disadvantaged school over the years 1961-1962 to 1965-1966. Those who stayed ("persisters") and who left ("defectors") were found to represent a variety of social backgrounds. The socioeconomic "environment in which our teacher subjects were raised and socialized appears to be unrelated to whether or not they later tend to remain in or leave disadvantaged schools."[2] Nor was any significant relationship found between persisters and the degree of their prior exposure to ethnic and social class groups. More unexpectedly, no significant difference was found between persisters and defectors with respect to their knowledge of the subcultures of the disadvantaged.[3]

Schafer and Olexa, in their study of high school tracking, concluded that evidence suggested "the operation of unofficial grade ceilings for non-college preparatory students and grade floors for college-bound students."[4] Miller and associates found teacher bias existed on the basis of socioeconomic status.[5]

---

[1] Denmark, Guttentag, and Riley, Communication Patterns in Integrated Classrooms, p. 34.

[2] Staten W. Webster and S. E. Torsten Lund, "Defectors and Persisters: Teachers of Disadvantaged Students," Integrated Education, 7 (1969) 53.

[3] Ibid., p. 54.

[4] Walter E. Schafer and Carol Olexa, High School Track Position and Academic Achievement, April, 1969, p. 14 (ERIC # ED 030 188).

[5] Charles K. Miller, John A. McLaughlin, John Haddon, and Norman A. Chansky, "Socioeconomic Class and Teacher Bias," Psychological Reports, 23 (1968) 806.

The factors involved in developing altruism or "prosocial behavior" were studied by Rosenhan. He distinguished between normative altruism--doing for others what others think ought to be done--and autonomous altruism--doing for others what you think should be done. Crucial to the development of altruism, Rosenhan found, is "the behavioral example provided by other altruists."[1] In a conflict between behavioral example and verbal preachment, children will follow the former. Behavior, not words, is the guide. Age is an important factor in altruism: "Generosity," Rosenhan holds, "is rare indeed in the six-year-old... At younger ages, kindness may be a matter of social conformity, but among older children it clearly is not."[2] This study would seem to have an important bearing on the development of a truly integrated classroom.

In a study of the racial factor in counseling, Banks and associates found that Negro clients preferred to work with a Negro counseler, regardless of experience, than with an experienced white counselor.[3] Vontress supports the finding of Banks.[4] Lewis, in an exchange of views, declared: "If racism is primarily a way of life in our society (and I believe that it is), then our regular counseling and guidance education programs are not set up to deal with a problem as widespread and as ingrained as this one is."[1] Nash has described the work of a new type of counselor-guidance person, the Integration Specialist.[2] The locale of the study is Syracuse, New York.

---

[1] David L. Rosenhan, "The Kindnesses of Children," Young Children, 25 (1969) 37.

[2] Ibid., pp.41 and 43.

[3] George Banks, Bernard G. Berenson, and Robert R. Carkhuff, "The Effects of Counselor Race and Training Upon Counseling Process with Negro Clients in Initial Interviews," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 23 (1967), 23 (1967) 71-72.

[4] Clemmont E. Vontress, "Cultural Differences: Implications for Counseling," Journal of Negro Education, Summer, 1969, p. 263.

A few studies have been made of efforts to change the social-ethnic attitudes of student teachers.[3] The findings are rather indeterminate. In addition, the records of a number of symposia and workshops as well as special guides to classroom practice in the desegregated school are available. Many of these are filled with helpful concrete suggestions, far too numerous even to list here.

---

1. Sinclair O. Lewis, comment in Counselor Education and Supervision, 9 (1969) 60; also, by Lewis, "Racism Encountered in Counseling," ibid., pp. 49-54; see, also, in the same issue, contrary views of Don W. Locke, pp. 50-59.

2. Kermit B. Nash, "Mental Health in the Desegregated School," Integrated Education, 5 (1967-1968) 28-36.

3. John Edward Gordon, Jr., The Effects on White Student Teachers of Value Clarification Interviews with Negro Pupils (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1965) (University Microfilms); Leo Baron Hicks, Sr., Apprentice Teaching and Exposure to Additional Information on Methods of Attitude Modification in Negro Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-11,864); Harry L. Miller, "The Relation of Social Class to Slum School Attitudes Among Education Students in an Urban College," Journal of Teacher Education, 19 (1968) 416-424.

While some are anchored in research, others are of a commonsense variety, richly informed by experience.[1]

3. THE FAMILY

In the preceding pages we have had occasion to refer to the role of the student's family in desegregation. Meketon stressed the supportive and counseling functions of parents. Coles had cited numerous clinical examples of the same phenomenon. Anderson found that achievement of desegregated Negro children bore no relationship to whether or not the children's families were intact or broken. In 1956, the schools of Louisville were redistricted and many children were assigned to schools of the opposite race. Garth reports that 45 percent of the Negro parents and 85 percent of the white parents involved requested that their children be transferred to schools of their own race.[1]

---

[1] Mark A. Chesler, "Interaction and Teaching Alternatives in Desegregated Classrooms," pp. 90-125, Racial Crisis in American Education, ed. by Robert Lee Green, (Chicago: Follett, 1969); Mark A. Chesler, Judith Guskin, and Phyllis Erenberg, Planning Educational Change, Vol. II: Human Resources in School Desegregation (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969); Paul C. Goldin, "A Model for Racial Awareness Training of Teachers in Integrated Schools," Integrated Education, 8 (1970) 62-64; Jonathan Jackson and David Kirkpatrick, A Report: Institute for the Preparation of Counselors and Teacher-Counselors for Effective Service and Leadership in Desegregated Schools, November, 1967 (ERIC # ED 020 557); Harold T. Johnson and Harold L. Tyer, Special Training Institute on Desegregation for Educational Systems of the First District of Georgia, October 30, 1967 (ERIC # ED 030 684); Bernard C. Kinnick and Stanton D. Platter, "Attitudinal Change Toward Negroes and School Desegregation Among Participants in a Summer Training Institute," Journal of Social Psychology, 73 (1967); Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, Improving Quality During School Desegregation, February, 1969 (ERIC # ED 029 363); Wilson Record, "The White Professional Educators and the Black Ghetto Schools," Journal of Negro Education, 39 (1970) 44-49; and Staten W. Webster and Nathaniel Pugh, The Team Approach to Solving Problems of Desegregation and the Disadvantaged Student in the Oakland Public Schools, April 25, 1967 (ERIC # ED 030 701).

In three studies, white children in desegregated schools were found to be less prejudiced than the white community in general: (1) in Alabama, according to Chesler and Segal, (2) in an integrated northern school, according to Kaplan and Matkom, and (3) in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, according to Sartain.[2] In their study of interracial schools in several small midwestern communities, Schmuck and Luszki found Negro students performing uniformly on a level at or above white students.[3] As measured by students' responses, Negro parents were more interested in children's schoolwork than were white parents; also, "Negro boys spoke of their families in significantly more positive terms than the white boys."[4]

Meyers studied Negro achievement in relation to family structures.[5] Her sample consisted of 46 Negro boys from a Harlem school, all were of normal intelligence and were evenly divided between good and poor achievers. She found:[1]

---

[1] Charles E. Garth, Self-Concepts of Negro Students Who Transferred or Did Not Transfer to Formerly All-White High Schools, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1966), p. 31.

[2] James A. Sartain, Attitudes of Parents and Children Towards Desegregation (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1966), 1. 136 (University Microfilms No. 66-10, 999).

[3] Richard Schmuck and Margaret B. Luszki, A Comparison of Negro and White Students in Several Small Midwest Communities (No place: No publisher, no date).

[4] Ibid., p.6.

[5] Edna O. Meyers, "Self-Concept, Family Structure, and School Achievement: A Study of Disadvantaged Negro Boys," (abstract) (New York: Northside Center for Child Development, n.d.)

> The hypothesis that Negro boys from an economically disadvantaged environment with a positive self-concept would be achievers in the elementary school situation was supported.... Based on a qualitative analysis of family interaction, a body of evidence was presented to support the final hypothesis that Negro boys would function as school achievers if at least one parent, or some adult in loco parentis, assumed executive guidance and control over the household.

Meyers pointed to the motivating influence of the civil rights movement and related activities and observed that these factors raised "new perspectives for teachers, guidance counselors, psychologists and family life educators working with and within the Negro community."[2] Rosenberg's study of parental interest, although not dealing specifically with Negro children and parents, arrived at a conclusion that is not dissonant with Meyers' conclusion: "... Rather extreme /parental/ indifference is associated with low self-esteem, but whether the interest in the child is strong or mild often appears to make less difference."[3] More broadly, a national study of school principals reported "that principals perceive that even in schools in the most disadvantaged areas, a large majority of the parents are interested in their children's performance."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Morris Rosenberg, "Parental Interest and Children's Self-Conceptions," Sociometry, March, 1963, p. 49. See, also Rosenberg, Society and the Adolescent Self-Image (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1966

In a study of Negro and white mothers of preschool children, Platoff found that whether a mother had herself attended integrated schools might be significantly related to her disposition to relate democratically to her children: "... Integrated education is the only additional predictor, beyond the major predictors of education and race, which yields a high correlation with the attitudes expressed by mothers in situations which symbolically represent typical mother-preschool child interactions."[2] The point was raised by Platoff as a possibility only.

In Hartford, Connecticut, Dunmore studied the decisions by eligible families, whether to participate in a voluntary busing plan with West Hartford. A long series of comparisons was made between families who accepted and those who refused the opportunity. Numerous social-psychological tests were taken by persons in both groups. Dunmore concluded that "communication and not social-psychological variables were critical to the acceptance of the opportunity."[3] Those who accepted had significantly more chance to accept.

In Chapel Hill, North Carolina, Prichard found that "after desegregation, many Negro parents are not as active in school functions as they were within their own segregated schools. Many of the most active and outspoken Negro parents in the Chapel Hill community became inactive and silent in the integrated school affairs."[1] This problem is rarely described in the research literature.

---

[1] Robert E. Herriott and Nancy H. St. John, Social Class and the Urban School. The Impact of Pupil Background on Teachers and Principals (New York: Wiley, 1966), pp. 42, 43.

[2] Joan C. Platoff, The Effect of Education and Race on the Language and Attitudes Verbally Expressed by Mothers of Preschool Children (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1967), p. 72. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-6165).

[3] Charlotte Jeanette Dunmore, Social-Psychological Factors Affecting the Use of an Educational Opportunity Program by Families Living in a Poverty Area (Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University, 1968), p. 161. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-9928).

In a study of educational climates, McDill and associates sought to establish the mechanisms whereby the climates affected student aspiration and achievement. In the process they studied intensively twenty high schools in eight states. "... The critical factor in explaining the impact of the high school enviroment on the achievement and educational spirations of students," they concluded, "is the degree of parental and community interest in quality education."[2] And further: "... The intellectual and social camaraderie between schools and families... appears to be the hallmark of schools with strong academic climates."[3] Undoubtedly, the families are white and middle-class. It would be most significant--and urgent--to explore whether such beneficial consequence would flow from close school-community relations with Negro and lower-class families!

4. THE KATZ AND PETTIGREW RESEARCHES

In 1964, psychologist Irwin Katz reviewed evidence from research on desegregation.[4] The review was highly tentative because of the paucity of studies. As a result, Katz's article contains several assertions on this fact:

1. "... Much of the evidence to be surveyed is only inferential."[5]

---

[1] Prichard, "Effects of Desegregation on Student Success in the Chapel Hill City Schools," p. 37.

[2] Edward L. McDill, Leo C. Rigsby, and Edmund D. Meyers, Jr., Educational Climates of High Schools: Their Effects and Sources, April, 1969, p.27. (ERIC # ED 030 205)

[3] Ibid., p. 28.

[4] Irwin Katz, "Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes," American Psychologist, June, 1964.

[5] Ibid., p. 381.

2. "There is a dearth of unequivocal information about Negro performance in desegregated schools."[1]
3. "However, there does not exist at present any comprehensive system of variables for predicting the specific effects of different conditions of stress on the Negro child's performance of various academic tasks."[2]
4. "Reports on the academic progress of Negro children in desegregated schools are on the whole inadequate for drawing any conclusions about the effects of biracial environments upon Negro performance."[3]

In his article, Katz summarized a series of experiments he and colleagues had conducted. They involved the effect of race of interviewer and/or competitor on the learning of Negro college students. Katz found that Negro students' awareness of competition by whites served to induce stress which, in turn, could be assumed to interfere with learning: "Research on psychological stress generally supports the assumption that social threat and failure threat are detrimental to complex learning."[4]

Some read this conclusion to indicate the likelihood that desegregation, by arousing anxieties in the desegregated Negro student, might not be in the student's real interest. Katz himself drew no such implication. Instead, as we have seen, he regretted the lack of evidence.

Since 1964, Katz has written six additional reviews of research.[1] Other reviews have also been published.[2] A

---

[1] Ibid., p. 383.
[2] Ibid., p. 390.
[3] Ibid., p. 396.
[4] Ibid., p. 396.

---

[1] See Katz, "Status of Research on School Desegregation," IRCD Bulletin, September, 1965, "Research on Public School Desegregation," Integrated Education, August-September, 1966; and a revised version of the 1966 item was published late in 1967 by the IRCD, Yeshiva University. Three more items by Katz: "Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools? The Policy Implications of Research," Integrated Education, 5 (1967-1968); "Factors Influencing Negro Performance in the Desegregated School," pp. 254-289, Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development, ed. by Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz, and Arthur R. Jensen; (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1968); and "A Critique of Personality Approaches to Negro Performance, With Research Suggestions," Journal of Social Issues, 25 (1969) 13-27.

[2] Thomas F. Pettigrew and Patricia J. Pajonas, Social Psychological Considerations of Racially Imbalanced Schools, published by the Massachusetts State Board of Education in April, 1965; Meyer Weinberg, Research on School Desegregation: Review and Prospect (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1965);Thomas F. Pettigrew, "The Negro and Education: Problems and Proposals, "Race and the Social Sciences, ed. by Irwin Katz and Patricia Gurin (New York: Basic Books, 1969); Robert P. O'Reilly and Associates, Racial and Social Class Isolation in the Schools, 1969; Ralph M. Dreger and Kent S. Miller, "Comparative Psychological Studies of Negroes and Whites in the United States, 1959-1965," Psychological Bulletin, Monograph Supplement, September, 1968; Nancy H. St. John, "Minority Group Performance Under Various Conditions of School Ethnic and Economic Integration," IRCD Bulletin, May, 1968; St. John, Minority Group Performance Under Various Conditions of School Ethnic and Economic Integration: A Review of Research (New York; ERIC, Teachers College, Columbia University, /1967/), ERIC # ED 021 945; and Morris I. Berkowitz, Studies of School Desegregation and Achievement. A Summary (Pittsburgh, Pa.: Commission on Human Relations, May, 1967)

A body of research has been built up. It is thus anachronistic to cite the 1964 Katz article as an adequate review of research.[1]

Katz has made one of the foremost attempts thus far to work out a social psychological theory of academic achievement and motivation in relation to racial differences. Following is a sketch of the theory.[2] Wherever feasible, we will refer to studies reviewed in the present work to illustrate or raise a question about the theory.

We can begin with the fact, experimentally observed, that Negro male college students tend to achieve less in the presence of white persons. A Negro in situations with whites is surrounded by symbols of social success; but while the incentive of success is high, the expectancy is low. He knows how much he's missing, but he's afraid he'll keep on missing it, he'll never catch up. The problem is how to raise the Negro's expectancy of success; with this, social achievement should rise, too.

In a series of experiments with college students, Katz found that "Negro students who had been average achievers in high school. . . were discouraged at the prospect of being evaluated by a white person, except when they were made to believe their chances of success were very good. But Negro students with a history of high academic achievement... seemed to be stimulated by the challenge of white evaluation, regardless of the objective probability of success.[1] The "evaluator" is analogous to the white teacher, not the white student. What Katz is saying, therefore, is that inasmuch as many Negro children have had a poor academic record, the whiteness of the teacher may well prove an added burden in the desegregated situation. The crucial feature of the situation, however, is not the color but the encouragement that the Negro child may receive from the white teacher.

---

[1] As does David A. Goslin, "The School in a Changing Society," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, October, 1967.

[2] Based on Katz, "Some Motivational Determinants of Racial Differences in Intellectual Achievement," 1966, to appear in the International Journal of Psychology; Katz "The Socialization of Academic Motivation in Minority Group Children," Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (1967); and Katz, Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools? The Policy Implications of Research, unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, November 16-18, 1967.

A further point made by Katz is that Negro children, along with most lower class children, have not experienced much outright parental approval while performing intellectual tasks. Thus, they "remain more dependent than middle class children on social reinforcement when performing academic tasks."[2] From Katz's further research, some still unpublished, he explained this point in more detail:[3]

> /Negro/ children are likely to be highly dependent on the immediate environment for the setting of standards and dispensing of rewards.... Teacher attitudes toward Negro children will be highly important for their classroom behavior.[4]

Support for this interpretation comes from a study by Wayson who found that "the children need me" was a reason very frequently offered by experienced teachers who remained in slum schools.[5]

Still another point made by Katz is that not white skin color but higher educational standards are a major part of the explanation for increased Negro achievement in white classrooms. The Negro students in Alabama (Chesler-Segal study) claimed to be making considerable personal gains although their school grades suffered as a result of transferring to a white school. A sizable part of their satisfaction is explicitly derived from their conviction that the white teachers are better than the Negro teachers in the segregated schools. It is not known whether the Negro students were aware that many of the same white teachers underestimated the academic capability of Negro students.

---

[1] Katz, "Some Motivational Determinants of Racial Differences in Intellectual Achievement," p. 4.

[2] Ibid., p. 8.

[3] Ibid., p. 13.

[4] Ibid.

[5] William W. Wayson, Expressed Motives of Teachers in Slum Schools, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1966).

Katz traces the major source of cultural differences in learning self-control, that is the ability to sustain "effort on tasks that are not consistently interesting, attractive, and which offer no immediate extrinsic payoff, either positive or negative."[1] Such sustained control results from a process of socialization, that is, standards of excellence are internalized and one develops the ability to "guide and energize performance whenever either immediate or delayed social evaluation is anticipated."[2] Middle class children have a greater opportunity to develop such a willingness to learn--or, better, to study.

A dominant concept in motivation theory is the need to achieve (*n* Achievement) which is regarded by many psychologists as a universal human disposition. Can it be said that low academic achievement results, in part or whole from a deficient *n* Achievement? Katz doubts the usefulness of the concept in this area: "... The lower class Negro pupil's disinterest in classroom learning may be less a matter of his lacking the achievement motive than of its being directed into nonintellectual pursuits."[3] In other words, the pupil might prefer to save his striving for the achievement of more worldly goals which are available outside the school building.

Katz returns, then, to explore further the development of self-regulatory behaviors. He is especially interested in learning more about the development of means of dispensing self-approval and self-disapproval so as to produce higher levels of performance. He reports preliminary findings from ongoing studies he and his colleagues are conducting at the Sampson School, a predominantly Negro school in Detroit. In this experiment in "the socialization of competence," Katz discovered that "low-achieving boys were more self-critical than high-achieving boys, and later showed a weak tendency to avoid a stimulus that had been associated with self-critical responses."[1]

---

[1] Katz, "The Socialization of Academic Motivation in Minority Group Children," p. 9.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

To be dissatisfied with one's own performance, to be self-critical, one must be able to measure one's own behavior against a standard. These low-achieving boys must have entertained high standards to be so disappointed in their own performance. Katz finds intriguing "the implication that among northern Negro children from homes of average quality, academic failure is not necessarily associated with low or unstable achievement standards."[2] The Negro children, that is to say, seem not to be failing because they are uninterested in learning. One cannot say, in other words, that these children "lack motivation."

In one sense, they are too well motivated. So rigid is their self-judgment that "what they seem to have internalized was a most effective mechanism for self-discouragement. The child... had been socialized to self-image failure."[3] Katz stresses that these children are not only punishing themselves by overly-harsh self-judgments; they are also suffering from "a history of punitive reactions by socializing agents,"[4] among them--presumably--the schools and parents. He assumes that the overly self-critical child has been overexposed to negative enforcements from parents and teachers. Katz states: "Low achievement, anxiety, and a propensity for self-devaluation, which are all interrelated, are each in turn related to perception of low parental interest and acceptance, and high parental punitiveness."[1] (In the research of Garth, reported in Chapter III, it will be recalled that transferees to white schools generally were severe in self-criticism.)

---

[1] Ibid., p. 35.
[2] Ibid., p. 36.
[3] Ibid., p. 37.
[4] Ibid.

High parental aspirations for their children have no real consequences for the parents because they do not know how to implement the aspirations. Their children, however, regard the parental aspiration as a directive and now try to fulfill the expectation. Typically, it does not work out. Katz speculates:[2]

> I suspect that as part of his adjustment to failure, the low-achieving Negro student learns to use expressions of interest and ambition as a verbal substitute for behavior he is unable to enact... As the Negro student falls increasingly behind in his school work, the expression of high verbal standards contributes to a growing demoralization.

Part of this interpretation resembles Blake's viewpoint.

The gap between expectation and reality is widened by the tendency of Negro school children to be taught by those whom Katz calls "teachers who are really unqualified for their role, who basically resent teaching them, and who therefore behave in ways that foster in the more dependent students tendencies toward debilitating self-criticism."[3]

If the child's very socialization is at fault, what may be done to remedy the educational deficiency? Katz holds that desegregation has demonstrated the feasibility of highly significant learning advances for large number of Negro students. More is to be gained than a simple increment in factual learning:[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 43.

[2] Ibid., p. 48.

[3] Ibid., p. 51. See results of Teacher Opinion Poll, "Teaching in Center-City Schools," NEA Journal, December, 1967, p. 63.

> ... The opportunity for biracial comparison is highly stimulating because it provides more useful information for self-evaluation than does comparison with other Negroes. This is so because, in general, white standards of intellectual ability and achievement are more relevant to future career prospects. Thus, biracial peer comparisons are socially facilitating because of their informational value.

Especially if ego-threats to the Negro child are minimized, he can benefit greatly from desegregated situations in which he measures himself and is evaluated cross-racially. As Katz comments: "Here emotional supportiveness on the part of the teachers would be of critical importance, both in its direct significance to Negro children, and in its influence upon the social reactions of their classmates."[2] His own experiments support this observation.

Yet, Katz is still puzzled by the persistence of some children. "Why is it," he asks, "that the low ability /Negro/ children give no indication of being demoralized by the large achievement gap between themselves and their white classmates?" With a candor rare in the literature, he replies: "I do not know the answer...."[3] He suggests, however, that participation in an interracial classroom gives the "overly self-critical, segregated children who had accepted a grossly exaggerated conception of their inferiority" a chance to correct the faulty self-evaluation. Singer's study affirms the crucial contribution of cross-racial comparison

---

1. Katz, Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools, p. 16. (emphasis in original).

2. Ibid., p. 18. See, also, comment by Nancy H. St. John, "The Effect of Segregation on the Aspirations of Negro Youth," Harvard Educational Review, summer, 1966 p. 294.

3. Ibid., p. 21.

to self-concept of Negro children. This thread weaves its way through numerous other research studies. Finally, Katz warns against ability grouping as it is presently practiced as unhelpful and perhaps detrimental.[1] One thinks of Gunthorpe's study in this regard.

In brief, then, Katz theorizes that the Negro deficit in school achievement results from inadequate socialization of self-directed learning. This weakness is compounded by repeated negativistic experiences in school and family. An exaggerated sense of discouragement develops. It can be overcome only by a considerate, sympathetic classroom regime that permits the Negro child to measure himself against white children and thereby gain a more accurate self-concept. In a middle class classroom the lower class Negro child can benefit from improved learning opportunities and relate his learning more directly to a career. This should afford him ample opportunity to develop the ability to direct his own learning.[2]

Pettigrew has put forward an approach which is congruent with the Katz theory. His central concept is: "Many of the consequences of interracial classrooms for both Negro and white children are a direct function of the opportunities such classrooms provide for cross-racial self-evaluation."[1] People get to know themselves by interacting with others, and they evaluate themselves by the standards in the comparison group. "Schools with a middle class milieu furnish higher comparison levels for achievement and aspirations; and these higher levels will be especially influential for disadvantaged Negro children whose referents otherwise would have lower levels."[2]

---

[1] That this was not understood in the earlier phases of desegregation can be seen from report in Wey and Corey, Action Patterns in School Desegregation, pp. 220 and 231.

[2] The general connection between self and future is explored through two different but helpful perspectives in: Herta Riese, Heal the Hurt Child. An Approach Through Educational Therapy With Special Reference to the Extremely Deprived Negro Child (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962) and A. Irving Hallowell, Culture and Experience (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955), chapter 4. "The Self and Its Behavioral Environment," Both views are summarized in Meyer Weinberg and Oscar Shabat, Society and Man, second edition (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965), pp.284-292 and 93-102.

Some observers have wondered whether perception of the discrepancy is not discouraging to the disadvantaged Negro child. In an interpretation of Pettigrew's point, Solomon comments: "Perception of a discrepancy can be motivating if the individual sees the other individual or group as a valid standard of comparison, and if he has some reasonable expectation of being able to eliminate or reduce the discrepancy."[3] Pettigrew himself points out that higher Negro achievement in integrated classrooms acts to keep comparison levels within reach. It is not integrated but segregated schools that, in Pettigrew's view, enhance "the likelihood of the operation of the three factors Katz found to depress Negro performance in biracial situations: lowered probability of success, social threat, and failure threat."[4]

---

1. Thomas F. Pettigrew, "Race and Equal Educational Opportunity," Harvard Educational Review, Winter, 1968, pp. 73-74.

2. Thomas F. Pettigrew, "Social Evaluation Theory: Convergences and Applications," p. 288, Nebraska symposium on Motivation 1967 ed. by David Levine, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967).

3. Daniel Solomon, Psychosocial Deprivation and Achievement Dispositions (Bethesda, Maryland: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1968) p. 11.

4. Thomas Pettigrew,"The Negro and Education: Problems and Proposals," p. 81.

5. SUMMARY

Student relations under desegregation have been marked by toleration, for the most part, and, less prominently, by both violence and positive respect. In many more cases than one would imagine, interracial friendships have developed. The old "saw" about students being more "liberal" than their parents is quite true, according to various studies. Whether in Syracuse or Detroit, students of the most varied social circumstances have learned to cooperate, and to their mutual benefit. Very few studies afford insights into the behavior of white students under desegregation.

Most administrative planning for desegregation has concerned political and (white) community problems; very little has dwelt on changes in classroom and curriculum. By and large, however, teachers seem to have attended to the single most important change in the classroom--they have made the Negro children feel welcome. This is far from saying that interracial classrooms are typically operating at or even near the maximum benefit to Negro and white children.

The relationship of the Negro family to successful desegregation is very intimate and necessary. On the other hand, we have many more case studies than systematic researches on the issue. It is difficult to piece the case studies together into a meaningful whole.

CHAPTER 5

THE RIVERSIDE SCHOOL STUDY

Riverside, California, a city of 140,000 people, is the largest American community engaged in a comprehensive school desegregation program. Eleven percent of the population is Mexican-American, six percent Negro, and the remainder Anglo. In the fall of 1966, the program was instituted.[1] Not only is the project notable for its scale; it is noteworthy also for the formal evaluation and research components built into the project. The study extends from June 1, 1967, to May 31, 1972. When completed, it will constitute a landmark in American social science.

The Riverside Study is a rare example of the joining of social science research with educational practice. The city school board and the University of California, at Riverside and Los Angeles, are conducting the study. A vast conspectus has been laid out by the leaders of the enterprise. As Pettigrew has observed, the project "is one of the first studies where the experimenter has a voice in the assignment of students."[2] Some 1,800

---

1. For historical background, see Troy Duster, "Violence and Civic Responsibility: Combinations of 'Fear' and 'Right,' " in Our Children's Burden, ed. by Raymond W. Mack, (New York: Random House, 1968); Nathaniel Hickerson, "Integrated vs. Compensatory Education in the Riverside-San Bernardino Schools, " in School Desegregation in the North, ed. by T. Bentley Edwards and Frederick M. Wirt (San Francisco, California, Chandler, 1967); and Irving Hendrick, The Development of a School Integration Plan in Riverside, California: A History and Perspective (Riverside, California: Riverside School Study, University of California, Riverside, September, 1968).

2. Thomas F. Pettigrew, "The Negro and Education," p. 55.

children constitute the sample: 651 are Mexican-American, 406 black and 712 Anglo. Full use is being made of computers. The volume of data can be imagined from Green's comment that during "the first year child and family interviews yielded more than three million bits of information along more than 1,600 dimensions."[1]

Five independent and nine dependent variables are being used, as follows:[2]

Independent variables

1. Predesegregation characteristics of the child
2. Characteristics of the home
3. Characteristics of peer group interaction
4. Characteristics of school environment
5. Impact of the "barrio" environment

Dependent variables

1. Academic achievement
2. Intellectual ability
3. Peer group interaction
4. Attitude toward the outgroup
5. Feelings about self
6. Emotional adjustment
7. Achievement motivation
8. Level of aspiration
9. Parental values, attitudes, aspirations, interaction patterns, and involvement in community activity.

---

1. James A. Green, School Desegregation and Achievement Related Attitudes, introductory talk at American Psychological Association, September, 1969, p. 7.

2. E. Raymond Barry, Robert R. Hewitt, Harold B. Gerard, Norman Miller, and Harry Singer, Factors Contributing to Adjustment and Achievement in Racially Desegregated Public Schools (Riverside, California: Riverside United School District, August, 1966).

It will be noted that studies reported in the present volume have employed one or more of all the Riverside dependent and independent variables.

Eventually, findings of the Riverside School Study will be reported in a series of monographs. None will be prepared until the project is completed. Already, however, reports have been released that deal with selected aspects. These will be examined below. A note of caution should be sounded: These results are fragmentary and give the observer only an indication of how the Study is progressing. In no case should any of these findings be regarded as "final." We shall analyze these findings in the order of subjects treated in the preceding three chapters.

1. Cognition development and academic achievement.

A three-year report found that the desegregation program had not lessened Anglo achievement nor increased achievement of minority children.[1] Note that this was not a longitudinal measurement, i. e., a long-term tracing of the record of the same children. It was a cross-sectional analysis. The greatest gain, by ethnic groups, was recorded by the Mexican-American children.[2]

Purl studied the development of cognitive skills during the first year of the Study. Higher I. Q. and reading scores in the desegregated sample, she found, were accounted for by increased Anglo scores only.[3]

---

[1] Harry Singer, Effect of Integration on Achievement in Riverside: A Three-Year Trend, August 31, 1969, p. 10.

[2] Ibid., p. 8.

[3] Mabel C. Purl, Progress Report (Riverside, California: Riverside School Study, October 15, 1968), p. 4. An earlier study by Purl, apparently not part of the Riverside Study as such, is Training and Assessing Cognitive Skills in First Grade Children in Segregated and Integrated Classrooms (Doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-10, 534).

Achievement tended to rise in proportion to the duration of desegregation. While her comment did not bear directly on the measured outcomes, Purl made an interesting observation:[1]

> In tallying the results for the primary grades, the writer was impressed several times to find that groups of integrated pupils achieved at different levels according to the level of the children with whom they were grouped. Children with equal or lower I. Q.'s scored higher on the reading tests when they were scattered severally among the classes in the receiving school, rather than clustered together in one or two groups.

Presumably, the final report will explore this potentially significant aspect thoroughly.

Purl and Carlson evaluated cognitive development at the Emerson School. Six measures were used. On both the Raven Progressive Matrices and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Tests Anglo children outscored Negro children. In the Goodenough Draw-a-Man Test, no significant differences were found between Negro and Anglo children. On tests of conservation of a substance Anglo children were higher than Negro children in three age groups; but in five other age groups, there were no significant differences. Anglos were higher in one age group, but no significant differences emerged for seven other age groups with respect to conservation of weight. A series of tests related to class inclusion: on just under a third, Anglos were higher; on the rest, there were no significant differences. On tests of relational thought (left-right tests) Anglos were higher in one-sixth; on the rest there were no significant differences.[2]

I. Q. and reading test data were studied by Purl and

---

[1] Ibid., p. 21.

[2] Mabel C. Purl and Jerry S. Carlson, Research in Cognitive Development. Emerson School McAteer Project M-14 (Riverside, California: Riverside School Study, August, 1969), pp. 2-20.

Kleinke. Regarded cross-sectionally, over a two-year period mean I. Q. scores did not decline across grades three, six, and ten.[1] A very significant socioeconomic difference existed between the Anglos, on the one hand, and the minorities, on the other. Minority children on the lower two socioeconomic levels scored significantly lower on reading scores than Anglo children on the same levels. Yet, there were no significant differences in reading scores between the Negro and Anglo children on the second highest socioeconomic level. (There were no Mexican-American children on the upper two socioeconomic levels.) Purl and Kleinke, however, conclude that differences in scores "must be accounted for by factors other than (or at least in addition to) socioeconomic level of the pupils involved."[2]

Canavan studied possible desegregation effects on field-dependence. This refers to the degree to which knowledge is dependent upon cues immediately present and thus not controlled by a process of logical reasoning by the subject. White children were least field-dependent, black children most.[3] An admittedly "highly speculative" interpretation of test results led Canavan to attribute a significant one-year decrease in field-dependence to desegregation.[4]

Yasar sought to discover any effects of desegregation on speech habits. Average word length was used as an index of size of vocabulary. Before desegregation, the Anglo children had the largest average word length, followed by Mexican-American and Negroes. At the end of a year, the same order still obtained. On the other hand, the gap between ethnic groups had narrowed; the average word length increased most for Negro children.[1] Average word length, Yasar found, was not related to intelligence.

---

[1] Mabel C. Purl and Chris Kleinke, Comparative Data for the Large-Thorndike Intelligence Test and Stanford Reading Test (Riverside, California: Riverside School Study, September, 1969), pp. 1-2.

[2] Ibid., p. 19.

[3] Donna Canavan, Field Dependence in Children as a Function of Grade, Sex, and Ethnic Group Membership, paper read at American Psychological Association, September, 1969, pp. 3-4.

[4] Ibid., p. 6.

2. Aspirations and self-concept

Green studied desegregation effects on self-awareness. Children were given ethnic pictures to identify. The percentages choosing correctly on "most like me" were:

80	Anglo
56	Negro
48	Mexican-American.

Instead of desegregation diluting ethnic self-awareness, the opposite happened. Minority children correctly identifying their ethnic group were more positive toward it than were children who identified incorrectly. "It would seem logical," Green speculated "... that school desegregation makes ethnic identification proceed at a faster rate than would happen in a segregated situation."[3]

Miller and Zadny studied the effect of desegregation on ego strength of children as expressed by ability to delay gratification. Most unexpectedly, on two separate tests no differences in delay of gratification were found among children in the three ethnic groups. A year of desegregation brought no change.[4] The researchers commented: "... Since there were no initial ethnic differences it seems unlikely that the desegregation experience should produce them."[1]

---

[1] Erhan Yasar, Desegregation as a Factor in the Speech Habits of School Children: A Statistical Approach, paper read at the American Psychological Association, September, 1969, p. 4.

[2] James A. Green, Racial Awareness and Identification in Young Children, paper read at the American Psychological Association, September, 1969, p. 3.

[3] Ibid., p. 4.

[4] Norman Miller and Jerry Zadny, Delay of Gratification in Black, White, and Mexican-American Elementary School Children, paper read at the American Psychological Association, September, 1969, p. 13.

Redfearn studied the ability of the children to pursue self-set goals; the primary interest was in motivation. A ring-toss game was the experimental task and the researcher sought data on expectations and performances of the subjects. Before desegregation, Mexican-Americans had the highest performance scores and the lowest expectations; Negroes had the highest expectations and medium performance; while whites had the lowest performance and medium expectations. A year of desegregation brought about a convergence among the three groups. Whites decreased slightly the discrepancy between expectancy and performance; Mexican-Americans in a desegregated school experienced a realistic increase in confidence as contrasted with Mexican-Americans still attending a segregated "barrio" school; and Negro students experienced a decrease in anxiety about their performance.[2]

3. The student in the classroom

Kimbrough surveyed 209 Negro eighth and ninth graders in three schools. Militancy was directly related to racial hostility against whites and to pessimism about the future of Negroes in this country.[3] Militancy bore no such relation in Mexican-Americans. The finding on anti-white hostility was not repeated in other studies discussed elsewhere in the present volume. Perhaps this age group--from twelve to fifteen years--is especially pessimistic and hostile.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] David Redfearn, Level of Expectation, Actual Performance, and Reaction to Success and Failure in Three Ethnic Groups, paper read at the American Psychological Association, September, 1969, p. 11.

[3] Jackie Kimbrough, Toward a Conceptualization of Militancy, paper read at the American Psychological Association meeting, September, 1969, p. 7.

In Purl's study, sociometric choices of children showed that while Mexican-American children in general were chosen as playmates, only high-achieving Negro children were selected.[1] The longer the period of integration, the greater the social acceptance and the less the anxiety. "Those children who perceived themselves as more favorably accepted by others achieved higher."[2]

Gerard reports findings of an experiment on aspects of competition between white and Negro students:[3]

> . . . When it is possible for a Negro child to think that his own poor outcome is due to prejudice on the part of others it appears to result in defensive reactions as well as relatively poor performance on a subsequent task. Furthermore, it tends to result in setting lower aspirations on the subsequent task which therefore makes it more likely that he will experience subsequent success.

Gerard's latter point is matched elsewhere in the literature as we have seen. Essentially, it is his position that desegregation may lead a Negro child to greater self-knowledge and thus to more realizable aspirations.

During the first year of desegregation, Mercer interviewed over one hundred elementary school teachers and principals. The teachers, according to Mercer, "spent considerable time talking about the problems of 'discipline' which they had had since desegregation."[4] While the criticism of desegregation by Riverside parents is overestimated, Mercer holds, "frequently overlooked are the obstacles to desegregation generated by the values and structures of the school system itself."[1] Besides this interesting sentence, however, scarcely anything more on the subject has been published yet by the Riverside School Study.

---

[1] Purl, Progress Report, October 15, 1968, p. 8.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Harold B. Gerard, Factors Contributing to Adjustment and Achievement (Riverside, California: University of California, Los Angeles, May, 1968), p. 23.

[4] Jane R. Mercer, "Issues and Dilemmas in School Desegration: A Case Study," Western Regional Conference on Testing Problems Proceedings, 1968, p. 8 (reprint).

Gerard, one of the leaders of the research effort, writing in the context of the Riverside Study, declared:

> We believe that the educational systems within this country perpetuate a kind of bigoted mediocrity of teaching and administrative cadres encrusted with traditional and irrelevant curricula.... A teacher with negative attitudes towards minority children and minority children with negative self-attitudes both represent severe handicaps in the learning process.[2]

It will be of great interest to learn from later reports how desegregation in Riverside may have modified these general strictures by Gerard.

In some informal remarks, Singer writes:

> Some evidence on the adjustment effects of integration are becoming apparent. For example, some Black members of the community are moving to the neighborhoods where their children are bused to school. 'Rap' sessions at the junior high school reveal some evidence of social relationships which, of course, would

---

[1] Ibid., p. 7.

[2] Harold B. Gerard and Bertram H. Raven, Intervention Programs to Overcome Psycho-Social Deficits (Bethesda, Maryland: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1968), p. 5.

> not have occurred without integration. Although such evidence can be gleaned, I doubt whether our measuring devices were sensitive enough or designed to reflect these attitudinal changes over a short period of time.[1]

It is hoped that an historical ethnography of the Riverside School Study will reveal just such crucial dimensions of a desegregation experience.

---

[1] Harry Singer, letter to the present writer, January 20, 1970.

CHAPTER 6

NON-NEGRO MINORITIES

Indian Americans, Mexican-Americans, and Puerto Ricans are the most educationally disadvantaged groups in the United States.[1] In numbers they include a half million, six million, and one million people.

As minorities, the three share certain disabilities. Being relatively powerless politically, their cultural distinctiveness has suffered from deliberate suppression as well as thoughtlessness. Segregation has been their usual lot in the schools, with Indian Americans suffering the most from this separation.

In this chapter, relatively few studies are reviewed primarily because they are relatively few.[2] We are interested in studies that explore a number of aspects of the distinctive problems as well as some that show the commonality of educational problems of minority children. We have sought to touch on the primary subjects raised in the preceding chapters as much as possible.

1. INDIAN AMERICANS

Scott studied the Tlingit Indians in Wrangell, Alaska.[3]

---

[1] John K. Folger and Charles B. Nam, Education of the American Population, A 1960 Census Monograph (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 151.

[2] A first-rate survey of the literature is Charles B. Brussell, Disadvantaged Mexican American Children and Early Educational Experience, 1968 (ERIC # ED 030 517).

[3] John C. Scott, Jr., Race and Culture Contact in Southeastern Alaska: A Study of the Assimilation and Acculturation of the Wrangell Tlingit and White (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1953).

He found them highly assimilated with the white population. Few Indian children speak or even understand Tlingit; parents urge their young to learn the ways of the whites and unlearn Indian ways. English is all but the universal language. The public school is attended by everyone except a small minority. "Children are not particularly concerned with racial distinctions," reports Scott, "and... common education in the public school has tended to mitigate cultural differences."[1] Between 1913 and 1950, every fourth marriage in Wrangell was interracial.[2] So far has the process of assimilation gone that one Tlingit defined a "native" as "a person who is ashamed of his ancestors."[3] An economic transaction seems to underlay the entire social arrangement: the Indians have been permitted to continue their age-old fishing industry while the whites control everything else as well as a considerable part of the manufacturing end of the fishing industry. The economic history of Tlingit-white relations includes no example of foreign destruction of Indian territory.

Anderson, Collister, and Ladd studied Indian academic achievement in the continental United States.[4] They found that the greater the degree of contact of the Indian child with the white man's culture, the higher he scores on educational tests.[5] Indian academic achievement was highest in public schools, and lower in the following order: mission, nonreservation boarding, reservation boarding, and day schools.[6]

---

1. Ibid., p. 263.
2. Ibid., p. 633.
3. Ibid., footnote, p. 15.
4. Kenneth E. Anderson, E. Gordon Collister, and Carl E. Ladd, The Educational Achievement of Indian Children (Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1953).
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., p. 47.

Five years later a much more pointed and detailed study was made by Coombs, Kron, Collister, and Anderson.[1] Altogether, the study covered 26,608 pupils (17,255 Indian, 9,353 white) in six geographical areas; the children were overwhelmingly rural. California Achievement Tests (CAT) were administered. Results were presented in group averages, so there was no opportunity to determine relative achievement by individual matching; no controls were used. Nor was there any effort to control socioeconomic status.

White fourth and fifth graders achieved near the norm on CAT; soon thereafter gains for both Indian and white children started falling. As time went on, the Indian-white achievement gap grew. In the tests, "Indian pupils compared best in spelling and least well in reading vocabulary."[2] Academic achievement was higher if English were spoken prior to school entrance, if the degree of "Indian blood" was lower, if the child lived off rather than on the reservation. Unfortunately, there is no way to tell whether the achievement was high because of living off the reservation, or whether one lived off the reservation if one had higher achievement. In the case of one area (Andarko), Indian children achieved about the same in the federal school as white pupils in the Albuquerque public schools did. (Many of the latter were Mexican-Americans.)

Learning variation under different conditions of ethnic mixture is of some interest. The Coombs team found that:

> Fourth graders attending "mostly white" schools /in Aberdeen/ were higher on the average on total score than those attending "mostly Indian"

---

[1] L. Madison Coombs, Ralph E. Kron, E. Gordon Collister, and Kenneth E. Anderson, The Indian Child Goes to School. A Study of Interracial Differences (Washington D. C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1958).

[2] Ibid., p. 5.

> schools. . . . In the Billings area. . . seventh grade pupils attending schools which were "half Indian, half white" scored higher on the average than those in the "mostly Indian" schools.[1]

Reviewing all their data on the issue, the team concluded: "There is a slight indication that Indian pupils attending public schools enrolling a large proportion of white pupils achieve better than those attending public schools with mostly Indian pupils but the evidence is by no means conclusive."[2]

The researchers were interested in discovering patterns of relations between Indian and non-Indian. They found that the Indian children in public schools--and thus in the best situation to choose friends from among non-Indians --still chose by far the greatest number of their friends from among other Indian children. This was true in Phoenix, Albuquerque, and Aberdeen areas. The non-Indian students of Albuquerque were unique in one respect: Many of them were Mexican-Americans of whom only a little more than one third (34.8 percent) had spoken English only prior to school entrance.[3] In other words, in this respect they resembled Indian children. They scored lowest of all non-Indian children, but higher than all Indian children in the area. The Coombs team raised but did not attempt to answer a speculative question as to whether these Mexican-American children "exercised less acculturation influence on their Indian classmates in the public schools than did their non-Indian contemporaries in the other areas."[4]

High achievers tended to be high aspirants to further education. An inconsistent trend was observed for whites to aspire higher during the lower grades and Indian children by the 11th and 12th grades.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 133.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid., p. 105.
[4] Ibid.

Greenberg, who had taught for two years in a Navajo school, studied integration problems among the Navajo.[2] He observed the barest minimum of special measures to prepare for receiving Navajo children in the public schools. "In many instances," reported Greenberg, "the school boards and superintendents were of the opinion that mere acceptance of Navajo children into their school system implied equality of education."[3] Greenberg warned against a well-meaning disposition to lower standards for Navajo children. He observed: "If the Navajo pupil succeeds within the accepted standards, he is more likely to be able to make his way both inside and outside of the Indian world."[4]

Dilling made a study of Indians in Ontario.[5] In May, 1963, he administered modified standard achievement tests to 1,459 Indian pupils. His major finding follows: "... Integrated Indian pupils achieved higher than Indian pupils in Indian schools only on the vocabulary and computation tests. On the comprehension test, there was an unexpected difference favoring Indian pupils in Indian schools over integrated Indian pupils."[6]

Brant and Hobart contrasted Danish and Canadian policies toward Eskimo education.[1] The Danish policy in Greenland is characterized as "cultural receptivity" and is marked by flexibility and tentativeness. The Canadian policy is characterized as ethnocentrism" and is marked by "rigidity and crash-program mentality of certainty."[2] Brant and Hobart write:[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 135.

[2] Norman C. Greenberg, Administrative Problems Related to Integration of Navajo Indians in Public Education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1963).

[3] Ibid., p. 92.

[4] Ibid., p. 100.

[5] H. J. Dilling, "Educational Achievement and Social Acceptance of Indian Pupils Integrated in Non-Indian Schools of Southern Ontario," Ontario Journal of Educational Research, Autumn, 1965.

[6] Ibid., p. 51.

> Among Greenlandic Eskimos there appears to be a high degree of maintenance of feelings of group self-esteem and a positive valuation of most aspects of traditional culture. Danes and things Danish are not accepted wholesale, mechanically, slavishly; ways of doing, attitudes, and motivational patterns are not, in a blanket manner, regarded as good by Eskimos because of their association with the Danish way of life.

The relations between Dane and Eskimo reflect cultural difference rather than cultural hierarchy.

In Canada, however:[4]

> The exclusive use of English as the language of instruction among children understanding this language little or not at all, by teachers knowing nothing of the Eskimo language, creates multiple difficulties. The first year to two years of

---

[1] C. S. Brant and C. W. Hobart, "Sociocultural Conditions and Consequences of Native Education in the Arctic: A Cross-National Comparison," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, November, 18-21, 1965.

[2] A somewhat more favorable interpretation can be found in J. Roby Kidd, "Education of the Canadian Indian and Eskimo," Integrated Education, December, 1966-January, 1967.

[3] Brant and Hobart, pp. 5-6.

[4] Ibid., p. 8.

> classes are given over almost entirely to teaching English. The tendency to use Eskimo among themselves is discouraged if not prohibited.

Many teachers of Eskimos gain satisfaction from the "mask-like smiling faces" of Eskimo children and regard them as evidence of a cheerful and happy adjustment. Far from it, according to Brant and Hobart. They explain that Eskimo parents, "in accord with tradition, commonly counsel their children to contain their emotions lest they make the white people at school feel unhappy."[1]

Griffen studied the Southern Ute people in southwestern Colorado.[2] She sought to discover whether a child's family structure had an influence on his ability to learn in an integrated school. She found that "the grade level at which a student does his best work correlates with the structure of his family orientation, and that the more extended the family is beyond nuclear, the more deferred will be the peak school performance achieved by the individual socialized therein."[3] Griffen had studied Ute, Anglo, and Mexican-American children in a school in Ignacio, Colorado, near Durango.

Bryde studied the Oglala Sioux at Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota.[4] A review of I. Q. and achievement scores of the youngsters there revealed a distinctive pattern. During the first three years of school on the reservation, the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 9.

[2] Joyce Griffen, Family Structure and School Performance: A Comparative Study of Students From Three Ethnic Backgrounds in an Integrated School (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1965) (University Microfilms No. 65-13, 334).

[3] Ibid., p. 2.

[4] John F. Bryde, S. J., The Sioux Indian Student: A Study of Scholastic Failure and Personality Conflict (Pine Ridge, South Dakota 57770: Holy Rosary Mission, 1966). See also, Bryde, "A New Approach to Indian Education," Integrated Education, September-October, 1968.

Sioux student is normal in intelligence but quite far from the norm on achievement tests; at the end of the third grade, the achievement lag is one-half grade to one-and-one-half grade. In fourth grade, the Sioux child suddenly enters a "golden age" of higher than norm achievement, which lasts until seventh grade or eighth grade. At that point, a sudden drop in achievement occurs, and by twelfth grade, "most Indian groups are as far as two years behind in achievement."[1] Bryde described this sharp reversal as the "cross-over phenomenon." He hypothesized that "the impact of the Sioux-white value conflicts, occurring primarily during the period of adolescence, creates in the Sioux student adjustment and personality deviations which, in turn, hamper achievement."[2]

Bryde studied three groups of Indian students, all attending schools on a reservation, and white students who attended public schools in small towns adjacent to the reservations:

164	Indian students who were eighth graders in eight schools on Pine Ridge Reservation.
159	Indian students who were ninth graders in two high schools on Pine Ridge Reservation.
92	Indian students who were seniors at two high schools on Pine Ridge and adjacent Rosebud Reservations.
415	
76	White students who were eighth graders in small-town public schools.
126	White students who were ninth graders in small-town public schools.
202	

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

All children filled out the Minnesota Multiphasic Personal Inventory (MMPI).

Analysis of the inventory replies showed Indian students significantly higher than whites in "social alienation, emotional alienation, self-alienation, social isolation, anxiety and depressions."[1] It is not clear whether, as Bryde states, the Indian students have a higher need to achieve.[2] A summary figure shows no significant difference between Indian and white need to achieve;[3] yet, separate figures show Indian boys and girls with a higher need to achieve than their white counterparts.[4]

Indian twelfth graders are a select group; sixty percent of Indian students drop out before that time. On MMPI scores, the twelfth graders "show themselves to be more comfortable with the world, more self-assured and self-confident," than Indians in earlier grades.[5]

Bryde, then, views the educational plight of the Sioux student as the outcome of a culture conflict, with serious personality consequences. This conclusion is closely in line with a recent federal government report:[6]

> For some time, determined efforts were made to destroy the many cultures of the Indian on the ground that they were major deterrents to full membership in our society. Schools were the institutions charged with this destructive function. As a result, a few Indians made

---

[1] Ibid., p. 80.

[2] Ibid., p. 80.

[3] Ibid., p. 80.

[4] Ibid., pp. 83 and 88.

[5] Ibid., p. 104.

[6] President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, The People Left Behind (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, September, 1967), p. 51. See, also, Virgil J. Vogel, The Indian in American History (Chicago, Illinois: Integrated Education Associates, 1968).

> the traumatic adjustment but many more did not.

Bryde has proposed a new curriculum for Indian education which aims at building confidence in the Indian culture.[1]

Tefft studied the differential impact of white contact upon Northern Arapaho and Shoshone high school students in Wyoming. He found that the Arapaho surpassed both Shoshone and white in self-to-other alienation and in anomie.[2] Students of both Indian backgrounds frequently interacted with white peers about equally, and seemed to enjoy equal access to educational and employment opportunities. Whites showed a strong preference for Shoshone. Tefft explains the historical background:[3]

> Over the last century the white community has come to consider the Shoshone tribe as the 'friend of the white man' because the Shoshone warriors under Chief Washakie's leadership invariably fought Plains tribes alongside the government armies. One of the Plains tribes which was an enemy of both the Shoshones and the whites was the Arapaho who, in contrast to the Shoshone, have always been considered troublemakers by the whites from early reservation days up until the present.

The Shoshone are regarded as the more "progressive" group.

But neither Indian group wants to become "white." Instead, both desire to be evaluated favorably by the whites who, in fact, constitute the Indians' reference group. Lacking status and membership in the white community, the Arapaho develop feelings of anomie. Possessing the former but not the latter, the Shoshone develop a sense of identity realistically based on acceptance by the socially powerful. Fanon would characterize the situation of Shoshone and Arapaho as "colonized."[1]

---

[1] See, also, William A. Brophy and Sophie D. Aberle (compilers), "Education," chapter 5 in The Indian. America's Unfinished Business (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966).

[2] Stanton K. Tefft, "Anomy, Values and Culture Change Among Teen-Age Indians: An Exploratory Study," Sociology of Education, 40 (1967) 150.

[3] Ibid., p. 154.

Miller studied Indian ninth-graders in twelve integrated schools in North Dakota. He first sketched the stark economic context of schooling for Indians: "A North Dakota Indian... who desires to live on the reservation today will be faced with the hard fact that fifty to ninety percent of the Indians residing there are unemployed.... The problem... is one of how best to prepare many Indians for life as a minority group in the dominant white society."[2] Indian students at integrated schools achieved on a higher level and scored lower on an alienation scale than did Indians attending segregated schools; they also accepted more of the values of white society.

Nevertheless, white students preferred to have extremely little to do with any Indian. Miller divided students making sociometric choices into two groups, white students who had had Indian classmates for eight years (residents) and those who had transferred into the integrated school and thus had Indian classmates for less than eight years. He found:[3]

> ... Not only did non-Indians select integrated Indians at a rate lower than would be mathematically expected, but that resident non-Indians selected those Indian pupils only to the same extent (seven percent) as did transfer

---

[1] See Frantz Fanon, Black Skin, White Masks.

[2] Harold J. Miller, The Effects of Integration on Rural Indian Pupils (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1968), p. 95. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-8560).

[3] Ibid., p. 96.

> non-Indians. Surprisingly, the attendance of the same school for eight years did not increase the acceptance of the Indians by their non-Indian classmates.

Fifty-seven of the non-Indians failed to choose even a single Indian classmate.

Miller concluded that "integration is truly in name only, and that within each classroom a segregated situation generally exists."[1] The track system was found in some schools to create classes almost homogeneous racially. "Unless some improvement is made in the preparation for, and in the transition of, Indian pupils to integrated schools," declared Miller, "... such transfer could well be potentially more harmful than helpful to these pupils."[2]

A National Study of American Indian Education is under way. The United States Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education has publicized some of the problems. Several private groups have recently sponsored nationwide meetings on the subject.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 97.

[2] Ibid., p. 99.

[3] See Herbert A. Aurbach ed., Proceedings of the National Research Conference on American Indian Education (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Society for the Study of Social Problems, 1967); Jack D. Forbes ed., California Indian Education. Report on the First All-Indian Statewide Conference on California Indian Education /1968/. Ad Hoc Committee on California Indian Education, 1349 Crawford Avenue, Modesto, California 95350; and Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory, First National Indian Education Conference, Conference Packet Report, December 17, 1969, 1640 East 78th Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55423.

2. MEXICAN-AMERICANS

During the 1930's and 1940's, many Master's theses about Mexican-American education were written, especially at the University of Southern California. Some are little more than simple questionnaire studies but a larger number contain potentially valuable statistical material which should be consolidated, if possible, and reworked. This has not been done in the present work.

Schroff studied teacher-parent relations in San Bernardino, California, and documented a wide gulf between the two.[1] Farmer studied school segregation in Ventura County, California.[2] His subjects were 619 children, of whom 290 were Mexican-Americans and 329 were Anglos; both segregated and non-segregated schools were used. Farmer stated that families of the two groups of children were very similar in socioeconomic status. He found that pupils' attitudes toward the other race in recreation were more favorable in non-segregated schools than in segregated schools."[3] In the non-segregated schools, social distance between Mexican-American and Anglo was less. Pratt's study of Colorado ended with a series of up-to-date recommendations on the importance of integrating at the earliest possible grade.[4] Cornelius studied the comparative effectiveness of certain curricular changes in

---

[1] Ruth Schroff, A Study of Social Distance Between Mexican Parents and American Teachers in San Bernardino, California (Master's thesis, University of Southern California 1936).

[2] William A. Farmer, The Influence of Segregation of Mexican and American Children Upon the Development of Social Attitudes (Master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1937).

[3] Ibid., p. 67.

[4] Philip S. Pratt, A Comparison of the School Achievement and Socio-Economic Background of Mexican and White Children in a Delta Colorado Elementary School (Master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1938).

La Jolla School near Plantia, California; the results were inconclusive.[1]

King's study of Bakersfield, California, found that a single school--Lincoln--enrolled nearly three-quarters of all the Negro students and somewhat more than one third of the Mexican-American students in the city.[2] While the latter were considerably less segregated than Negroes, except for sports they had little to do with Anglos.

Calderon, Goldner, and De Hoyos studied Mexican-Americans in small and medium-size northern cities: Des Moines, St. Paul, and Lansing, Michigan.[3]

Calderon's study of one hundred Mexican-American families in West Des Moines is interesting for various cultural attitudes. She reported that all the families with children attending high school "are sincere in the desire that their children receive an education in order to avoid the suffering that they have endured, and to be equipped to make good and easier livings."[4]

One informant complained of the egocentricity of Americans; one evidence of this was the fact that they never omit the 'I,' as is done in Spanish."[1] Another criticized the Americans because "they are so anxious to make money and to get ahead that they do not even have time to give a friendly greeting to a person, as do well-educated people."[2] Speaking of the families as a whole, according to Calderon, "they consider it a waste of time to send a child to school for the first years, here, because they are required only to play, which they can do at home."[3] One informant stated that according to a friend, Mexican-American and Anglo children were placed in separate rooms in the same building in schools in Mason City, Iowa.[4]

---

[1] John Scott Cornelius, The Effects of Certain Changes of Curriculum and Methods on the School Achievement of Mexican Children in a Segregated School (Master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1941).

[2] John Randle King, An Inquiry Into the Status of Mexican Segregation in Metropolitan Bakersfield (Master's thesis, Claremont Graduate School, 1946, p. 19).

[3] Judith Batista Y Calderon, A Study of Counter-Prejudice in a Mexican-Spanish Community in the Surroundings of Des Moines (Master's thesis, Drake University, 1948); Norman S. Goldner, The Mexican in the Northern Urban Area: A Comparison of Two Generations (Master's thesis, University of Minnesota, 1959); and Arturo De Hoyos, Occupational and Educational Levels of Aspiration of Mexican-American Youth (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1961) (University Microfilms Order No. No. 61-2687).

[4] Calderon, p. 16.

In Goldner's study of two generations of Mexican-American males in St. Paul, formal education was the great divide between generations. "The trend," Goldner reported, "is for the generations to hold increased educational and professional aspirations for their sons as they become increasingly urban: 'grandfathers' choosing education and the professions eight percent of the time, the 'fathers' about sixty percent of the time, and the 'sons' eighty-four percent."[5] So great was the generational gap because of American schooling that "already some grandfathers are in the awkward situation of not being able to speak with their grandchildren, who know no Spanish.[6] With greater job mobility as a result of educational attainments, however, the younger generation is meeting with much more anti-Mexican prejudice. The older generation did not constitute any real competition to Anglos.

De Hoyos found that "school integration... provides /Mexican-Americans/ many new types of social interaction with the dominant group."[7] His sample of ninety-one

---

1. Ibid., p. 27.
2. Ibid., p. 28.
3. Ibid., p. 68.
4. Ibid., p. 55.
5. Goldner, p. 88.
6. Ibid., p. 106.
7. De Hoyos, p. 13.

Mexican-American boys, ages fifteen to eighteen, strongly aspired to a higher occupation than the one held by their fathers. Acculturation, held De Hoyos, was proceeding much faster in Lansing than in the Southwest where it was being actively resisted by Mexican-Americans.[1]

Ulibarri explored the sensitivity of teachers to cultural differences among students.[2] He selected 100 teachers who had taught Anglo, Indian American, and Mexican-American children; twenty controls were also selected who had taught only one of these groups of children. The results showed very clearly that there is "a general lack of teacher sensitivity to and awareness of socio-cultural differences. . . ."[3] The teachers also demonstrated a surprising unawareness of differential educational opportunities being offered children in the three ethnic groups. For example, "teachers believe that the school is meeting the psychological needs of children equally well for all three ethnic groups" and "teachers in general think that all the groups are achieving at grade level."[4] Rubel studied Mexiquito, an urban neighborhood in Weslaco, Texas, in the Lower Rio Grande Valley.[5] He found strictly segregated schools for Anglos, Mexican-Americans, and Negroes. Three-fourths of the sixth graders (mostly Mexican-American) dropped out of school at this grade. Mexican-Americans have historically been excluded from the professions in Weslaco, but the situation has changed somewhat since the return of World War II veterans. Taba described a junior high school in southern California which both Negroes and Mexican-Americans attended. Ability grouping, she reported, resulted in increased social distance among the children.[1] In a comparative study of creativity, Schmadel, Merrifield, and Johnson reported that "there is . . . no indication of differences in test performance attributable to ethnic background, to any . . . predictively useful degree; there is a hint that, other things being equal, Mexican-Americans may tend to perform slightly better on figural tests than do Anglo-Americans."[2] The study was based on test responses by 314 sixth graders in the San Gabriel School District.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 116.

[2] Horacio Ulibarri, Teacher Awareness of Socio-Cultural Differences in Multi-Cultural Classrooms (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1959) (University Microfilms Order No. 60-1261).

[3] Ibid., p. 90.

[4] Ibid., pp. 70 and 84.

[5] Arthur J. Rubel, Social Life of Urban Mexican-Americans (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1962) (University Microfilms Order No. 63-3561). See, also, Rubel, Across the Tracks: Mexican-Americans in a Texas City (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1966).

Heller studied 165 Mexican-American male high school seniors in Los Angeles.[3] Her primary interest was in the occupational ambitions of the young men and the means they envisioned for achieving the goals. Mexican-American aspirations were very like those of Anglos, especially when social class was equated. The former, however, have considerably more realistic conceptions of what they expect to get.

Heller divided her sample into two groups:

---

[1] Hilda Taba, School Culture. Studies of Participation and Leadership (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1955), p. 95.

[2] Elnora Schmadel, Phil Merrifield, and Henry Johnson, "The Performance of Mexican-American and Anglo-American Pupils on the Minnesota Test of Creative Thinking," unpublished paper read to the CASPP annual conference, March 20, 1964.

[3] Celia S. Heller, Ambitions of Mexican-American Youth. Goals and Means of Mobility of High School Seniors, (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1964) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-11, 296).

98	boys in two predominantly Mexican-American schools (segregated)
67	boys in six predominantly Anglo-American schools (integrated)

Sixty-four percent of the latter and forty-nine percent of the former aspired to non-manual occupations.[1] The two are alike, however, in educational expectations. But, declared Heller, "whether the Mexican-Americans will move toward the occupational distribution of the population at large depends, among other things, on whether their children will break out of the school ghettos they are now in."[2]

Heller notes that a fundamental reorientation toward formal education has taken place in the Mexican-American community in Los Angeles since 1945: "The real break-through in the pattern of Mexican-American non-mobility was made after the war by the returning G. I.'s. When they started enrolling in college, they were referred to in their community as locos, crazy."[3] Previously, such attempts had been regarded as futile. Heller also states that the establishment of a junior college in East Los Angeles had a significant effect.[4]

If Mexican-American youth do not as yet match their aspirations with actual preparation for professional careers, this is a note of realism, for such careers are in fact not readily available to them. Mexican-American I. Q. scores are sharply lower than those of Anglo-Americans; when students are equated for social class, however, the gap closes significantly but the difference is still substantial.[5] I. Q. scores of Mexican-American students were found by Heller to vary significantly (at the level of .001) with size of family; the smaller the family, the higher the I. Q. Anglo families being smaller on the average, their I. Q.'s were higher.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 98.
[2] Ibid., p. 101.
[3] Ibid., p. 258.
[4] Ibid., p. 117.
[5] Ibid., p. 155.

Heller probed certain social values traditionally classified as Mexican and others as Anglo-American. She found in the area of social values that in general: "Mexican-American high school seniors... largely resemble their Anglo-American peers, especially when the factor of class is controlled."[2] What happened to the Mexican cultural values of defending family honor and of preferring to smooth over disagreements rather than effecting a blunt confrontation? Heller writes:[3]

> ...A much larger proportion of Mexican-American boys in the "integrated" schools (seventy-four percent) than in the "non-integrated" schools (fifty-five percent) answered that they prefer to be the kind of person who "never lets an insult to his or his family's honor go by...." Among the ... [integrated], only forty-two percent but among the [segregated] sixty-five percent expressed preference for pointing out real issues to facilitate intelligent arguing over disagreements.

As for belief in individualism and orientation toward the future, some interesting contrasts emerged.

Significantly more Mexican-Americans than Anglo-Americans "chose to give up the pleasures of the present in order to assure the future."[4] Both groups have about the same order of orientation to the future. Both are devoted to individuality, but not to the point of risking social isolation; the Mexican-American boys showed this tendency more than the Anglo-Americans.

In Heller's view, "the school socializes the Mexican-

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 164.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 208.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 197 and 217.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 228.

American boy in mobility values but fails to socialize him in mobility-inducing behavior."[1] The capacities of Mexican-American youth are left underdeveloped by the schools. Teachers simply do not expect Mexican-Americans to learn as much as they expect of Anglo-American children. Indeed, according to Heller, the well-meaning but misdirected teacher "is more likely to be concerned with doing something so that the Mexican-American child 'should not feel inadequate' instead of doing something so that the child would stop being inadequate."[2]

Parsons studied the two worlds of the Mexican-American and the Anglo in a small town of 1,800 located 150 miles south of San Francisco.[3] Mexican-Americans made up 55 percent of the population of "Guadalupe."[4]

The family is the dominant relationship in the life of the Mexican-American child. Paramount are the obligations between parents and children and between brothers and sisters. Children are strictly supervised until they are twelve or thirteen; it is largely for this reason that Mexican-American children attend few school functions. Many of these cultural facts of life are unknown to Anglo teachers. As Parsons reported: "What some teachers have pointed out to the researcher as 'cliques' turned out to be groups of brothers and sisters and cousins who play and eat together because this is what is expected of them, by each other and by their parents."[5] What is family solidarity to some appears as ethnic cleavage to the outside observer.

But that ethnic cleavage is all but complete in Guadalupe. Except for a single teacher in the town, "not a single Anglo had ever been inside a Mexican home."[6] In every aspect of the town's life--making a living, church-going, recreation, and more--the Mexican-American feels his separateness and his subordination. The Mexican-American accepts the subordinate role completely.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 244 (emphasis added).

[2] Ibid., p. 246 (emphasis in original).

[3] Theodore W. Parsons, Jr., Ethnic Cleavage in a California School (Doctoral dissertation in Education, Stanford University, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-2602).

[4] This town is Castroville, California.

[5] Ibid., p. 139.

[6] Ibid., p. 207.

The school is a typical Guadalupe institution. While Mexican-Americans make up only fifty-seven percent of enrollment, the principal and teachers--all Anglo--over-estimate the percentage. Most teachers are convinced Mexican-American children are less intelligent than Anglo children. Parsons checked I. Q. scores for both groups and found the following distribution of mean scores:[1]

Grade	Anglo	Mexican-American
3	97	91
4	110	92
5	111	104
6	111	99
7	104	97
8	97	95

Ability-grouping is practiced to an extreme degree with the high-ability classes being almost entirely Anglo. A teacher explained to Parsons that such classes are kept as "small as possible because we feel that the brighter pupils deserve a chance to get as much as they can out of school without being held back by the kids who are dull or just lazy or don't care."[2]

Parsons sat in on numerous classes and compiled an extensive log of teacher practices that illustrated the every-day reality of ethnic cleavage. Anglo "helpers" were used by teachers; no Mexican-American children were ever so used. Very often and systematically teachers ignored Mexican-American children's hands in favor of calling on Anglos. Often, while Mexican-American children were

---

1. Ibid., p. 264.
2. Ibid., p. 271; see, also, p. 281.

reciting, teachers interrupted them to listen to an Anglo child. Teachers related very informally with Anglo children, inquiring about family affairs and the like; with Mexican-American children they were very strict. Teachers went out of their way to praise and encourage Anglo children while just as regularly criticizing Mexican-American children. Frequently, teachers explained to Parsons that preferential treatment for Anglo children was necessary because they were going to grow up to lead Guadalupe and they might as well get used to it early.[1]

Parsons administered sociometric tests in February, 1965. Anglos expressed stronger self-preferences than did the Mexican-Americans. Anglos looked toward other Anglos for prestige while Mexican-American children looked to both groups. Mexican-Americans, however, were more interested in Anglo prestige than Anglo companionship.[2] In various ways the relative self-depreciation of Mexican-Americans can be seen:[3]

> The Mexican pupils... considered themselves to be about as attractive as the Anglo pupils. When choosing persons who are thought to be unattractive, however, the Mexicans tended to choose in their own group more than among Anglos.... ninety-four percent of the Anglos and eighty percent of the Mexicans chose Anglos as being "smart," and ... eighty-eight percent of the Anglos and seventy percent of the Mexicans chose Mexicans as being dumb.... Anglo pupils generally consider the Mexican pupils to be lazy and not to care, a consideration which, interestingly enough, is reflected in the choices made by the Mexican pupils themselves.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 296-297 and passim.

[2] Ibid., p. 355.

[3] Ibid., pp. 361, 363, and 368.

Acceptance of social subordination is clear throughout.

The school of Guadalupe, then, reflects strongly the value given to Anglos in the town. Parsons broadens his portrait: "Where, as in the case of Southwestern communities like Guadalupe, the social structure exhibits caste-like features based on ethnic differentiation, the school as one of the 'most vital of all institutions,' will be operated by and in the interests of the dominant group."[1] Parsons' study is outstanding for its realism, its intimate knowledge of the most ordinary details of everyday life, and for its clear concept of power in relation to education. We may be permitted perhaps the observation that the "Guadalupes" of America, while still numerous, are definitely becoming less important to the rapidly urbanizing Mexican-American. (In 1967, 175,000 Mexican-Americans lived in East Los Angeles.)[2] One hopes that Parsons' approach will be applied to the study of ethnic cleavage in the great cities of the country.

Jacobson studied the phenomenon of successful students of Mexican-American background in the schools of South San Francisco, California. Both successful and unsuccessful students shared the same cultural origin and disadvantaged homes. The homes could not be used to explain both success and lack of success. Jacobson turned her attention to the teachers. She found, although not conclusively, that a teacher's fore-knowledge of a Mexican-American child's I. Q. affected the teacher's characterization of the child as "looking more American." The higher the I. Q. the greater the likelihood of the child's impressing the teacher as being more American. This led Jacobson to an "irresistible conjecture":

---

[1] Ibid., p. 391.

[2] Rep. George E. Brown, Jr., in U. S. Congress, 90th, 1st session, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education, Bilingual Education Hearings, II (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 427.

5

> If both teachers that know the children and teachers that don't know them see the older high achievers as looking more American, achievement may be the result of experiencing encouragement to achieve. If older Mexican children who look more American to teachers tend to be higher achievers after five or six years' experience in the school than do the children who look more Mexican to teachers, a sorting process may be in operation.[1]

The researcher's final conjecture was: "Perhaps few disadvantages would remain if teachers practiced parity of esteem."[2]

In San Antonio, Texas, MacMillan studied the impact of certain socioeconomic factors on the school achievement of 722 Mexican American, Negro, and Anglo students in twelve schools. Achievement scores correlated significantly with occupation of father, attendance, and intelligence. Comparisons of the three groups were not controlled for socioeconomic status. In an analysis of attendance, MacMillan found that Mexican-American children had the best record among the three groups when the temperatures stood at 60° F. As the weather grew colder, however, attendance dropped sharply because of lack of suitable clothes to wear. Yet, "an analysis of variance showed no significant difference between the Anglo and

---

[1] Lenore F. Jacobson, Explorations of Variations in Educational Achievement Among Mexican Children, Grades One to Six (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1966), pp. 42-43. (University Microfilms Order No. 66-15, 306).

[2] Ibid., p. 52

Mexican-American attendance means."[1]

Anderson and Safar studied equal educational opportunities in two southwestern communities. In Community A, Indian and Mexican-Americans made up fifteen percent of the population. Anglos dominate the school board, administration, and faculty. In Community B, minorities constitute sixty percent of the population. Spanish Americans fill four of the five seats on the school board. School board members in Community A are under the erroneous impression that all children are equally encouraged in the schools. In Community B, the board members complain of unequal treatment of students while teachers and administrators believe there are no substantial differences. "Because of this gulf between the communities and their professional education," the researchers observe, "the schools fail to assist the minority child in overcoming his educational handicaps and little is done to offer true equality of educational opportunity."[2] The Mexican-American child tends to internalize the community's low achievement expectations for him.

Galvan analyzed the handicap imposed upon the Mexican-American child by the failure to use Spanish language testing instruments. He experimented in a Dallas school with one hundred Mexican-American third, fourth, and fifth graders. They came from the same neighborhood. Each student took two versions--English and Spanish--of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC). Here are the mean scores, by sex:[1]

---

[1] Robert Wilson MacMillan, A Study of the Effect of Socioeconomic Factors on the School Achievement of Spanish Speaking School Beginners (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1966), p. 224. (University Microfilms Order No. 67-3327).

[2] James G. Anderson and Dwight Safar, "The Influence of Differential Community Perceptions on the Provision of Equal Educational Opportunities," Sociology of Education, 40 (1967), 230.

	N	Mean Age, Years	Mean English Full scale I.Q.	Mean Spanish Full scale I.Q.
Boys	50	9.38	87.80	99.20
Girls	50	9.51	92.48	104.84
Total	100	9.44	90.14	102.02

The distribution of all the scores by I. Q. group was as follows:[2]

		English WISC	Spanish WISC
130+	Very superior	--	2
120-129	Superior	--	5
110-119	Bright normal	1	15
90-109	Average	57	60
80- 89	Dull normal	28	11
70- 79	Borderline	11	5
69 & below	Mental defective	3	2

The same order of increase was found in a comparison of English-Spanish differentials on verbal and non-verbal subscores in the tests.[3]

A somewhat similar study was made by Davis and Personke in Victoria, Texas. Eighty-eight Mexican-American children scored about the same on Spanish and English versions of a "readiness" test. On word-meaning, however, the children scored significantly higher on the Spanish language test. This finding would seem to cast considerable doubt on the practice of the school system in grouping first-grade entrants "according to judged ability to use English." The researchers state that such a conclusion is not necessarily warranted.[1]

---

[1] Robert Rogers Galvan, Bilingualism As It Relates to Intelligence Test Scores and School Achievement Among Culturally-Deprived Spanish-American Children (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1967), p. 35. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-1131).

[2] Ibid., pp. 36 and 38.

[3] Ibid., p. 44.

Vogler studied possible discrimination in a pictorial test of intelligence. His subjects were 108 Mexican-American and Anglo first graders in Tucson, Arizona. Vogler found that socioeconomic status accounted for more of the differences between the groups than did ethnic membership. The Deviation Intelligence Quotient of the test used in the study "tends to discriminate against children from the Mexican-American and lower socioeconomic status cultures...."[2]

Chandler and Plakos studied the placement of forty-seven Spanish-speaking children in classes for the Educable Mentally Retarded in California. English and Spanish editions of WISC were used. Scores by I. Q. groups were as follows:[3]

---

[1] O. L. Davis, Jr. and Carl R. Personke, Jr., "Effects of Administering the Metropolitan Readiness Test in English and Spanish to Spanish-Speaking School Entrants," Journal of Educational Measurement, Fall, 1968, p. 233.

[2] James Donald Vogler, The Influence of Ethnicity and Socioeconomic Status on the Pictorial Test of Intelligence (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1968, p. 69.) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 833).

[3] John T. Chandler and John Plakos, "Spanish-Speaking Pupils Classified as Educable Mentally Retarded," Integrated Education, 7 (1969), p. 30. See also Nelson Diaz-Mora, The Availability and Adequacy of Some Spanish Translated Tests (Master's thesis, Western Michigan University, 1969). (University Microfilms Order No. M 1832).

	English WISC	Spanish WISC
100+	--	2
90-99	--	6
80-89	3	19
70-79	22	16
Below 70	22	4

The higher scores registered on the Spanish-language version are especially impressive inasmuch as the children involved were originally classified as retarded. Median scores rose from 70 on the English WISC to 83 on the Spanish language WISC. Chandler and Plakos note: "... Some /of the children/ have spent as long as three years in a 'special' class and as such may not have received the same advantages as pupils with comparable I. Q.'s in regular classes; the 'special' placement may have been a retarding influence."[1]

In Los Angeles, California, Derbyshire studied identity crisis among Mexican-American adolescents. He found that identification with Mexican culture served "as an integrative technique for reducing adolescent identity and role-conflict."[2] Those who do so identify are more education-minded, and experience fewer school failures and arrests. They regard school as a way of getting ahead. They tend to blame themselves when things go wrong. The more Americanized peers are near the other pole for each of these characteristics. Thus, concludes Derbyshire, "... forced acculturation of minorities by the dominant group may be dysfunctional for adequate and accurate integration of dominant value orientations and behaviors."[3]

---

1. Ibid., p. 31.

2. Robert L. Derbyshire, "Adolescent Identity Crisis in Urban Mexican Americans in East Los Angeles," p. 108 in Minority Group Adolescents in the United States, ed. by Eugene B. Brody (Baltimore, Maryland: Williams and Wilkins, 1968).

3. Ibid., pp. 73-110.

Support for Derbyshire's conclusions is found in Kimball's study of 1,681 junior high school students in Los Angeles. He reported:[1]

> ... A substantially higher proportion of the Mexican American students born in Mexico achieve high grades than those /Mexican-Americans/ born in California or the Southwest.... Those pupils reporting the highest level of family use and knowledge of Spanish also receive the largest proportion of high grades....

Kimball was puzzled by this finding. In explanation, he speculated that "a process of ghettoization takes place, in which the longer a family line remains in the large segregated Mexican-American communities of the Los Angeles area, the more inward-grown they become and the less inclined to acculturation and achievement in the Anglo culture."[2]

Both Derbyshire and Kimball see Mexican culture as a positive force in the life of these young people. Kimball, however, sees the urban barrio as antithetical to their achievement. Evidently, sub-cultural influence need not exist on a restricted geographical base as is posited by some contemporary black nationalists. Kimball's point gains additional force from another of his findings: The achievement of Mexican-American students is directly related to the percent Anglo in the school. This desegregation effect is one of the most important influences on their achievement and is exceeded only by parental factors.[1] (On the latter, one must reckon with Guerra's point: "... Our Chicano students often come to college in spite of their parents rather than because of them; and their presence in college is evidence of their rebellion rather than familial conformity."[2])

---

[1] William L. Kimball, Parent and Family Influences on Academic Achievement Among Mexican-American Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968), pp. 99 and 124. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-16, 550).

[2] Ibid., p. 217.

Malry studied aspirations of Anglo, Mexican-American, and Negro ninth and twelfth graders in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The Mexican-American families were the poorest. Of the three groups, Mexican-American students had the lowest self-image; they feel "that they just can't learn, and... that they could do better in school if only the teacher would not go so fast."[3] Absolute educational aspirations are low and related to social class. One exception is the inverse relationship of relative college-going aspirations to social class.[4] There was some indication that the educational aspirations held by Negro and Mexican-American parents for their children declined between ninth and twelfth grades.[5] If so, this might be a reflection of increasing realism as the actuality of job-seeking approached.

Certain aspects of Mexican-American acculturation in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, were examined by Matthiasson.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 220. See, also, George W. Mayeske, "Educational Achievement Among Mexican-Americans: A Special Report from the Educational Opportunities Survey," Integrated Education, 6 (1968) 35.

[2] Manuel H. Guerra et al., The Retention of Mexican-American Students in Higher Education with Special Reference to Bicultural and Bilingual Problems, May, 1969, p. 16 (ERIC # ED 031 324).

[3] Lenton Malry, The Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Anglo, Spanish, and Negro High School Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1968), p. 52. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-8284).

[4] Ibid., p. 71.

[5] Ibid., p. 76.

In that city, she found, "there is no such thing as a Mexican-American ghetto. . . . "[1] From interviews with sixty informants who had ninety children older than eighteen years, she found that the extent of the formal education of these offspring largely depended on whether they were born in Mexico, Texas, or Milwaukee:[2]

	Mexico	Texas	Milwaukee
College	0%	0%	8%
12th grade	33	0	62
1-11th grade	0	50	26
0-7 grades	67	50	3

So many of the younger children speak no Spanish that Matthiasson predicts that "in the majority of cases, bilingualism will not survive past the next generation. "[3]

Matthiasson's characterization of the general situation of the Mexican-Americans in Milwaukee is of interest:[4]

> The informants do have opportunities for more social interaction with Anglos than do the Mexican-Americans in the Southwest. In Milwaukee, they are allowed residential and occupational mobility. The schools attended by their children are not segregated along ethnic lines. In short, they have not been forced into a group which is socially and geographically isolated from contact with Anglos.

This may well lead to more rapid acculturation than in the Southwest.

---

[1] Carolyn Weesner Matthiasson, Acculturation of Mexican-Americans in a Midwestern City (Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1968), p. 10. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-5766).

[2] Ibid., p. 44.

[3] Ibid., p. 49.

[4] Ibid., p. 140.

The case in Pomona, California is quite different, according to Penalosa and McDonogh. There, Mexican-Americans make up ten percent of the population, most live in an ethnic enclave, and are predominantly lower class.[1] Acculturation of this minority is far more advanced than might seem evident from its depressed economic position. This finding, the researchers conclude, offers "added support to the expressed demands of Mexican-American leaders in the Southwest for superior schooling... as a major force in both acculturation and social class mobility."[2]

Rosenblatt studied impulse control of eighty-five Mexican-American and Anglo first graders in Tucson, Arizona. It is commonly believed that lower class children, including Mexican-Americans, lack the ability to delay gratification and thus are less effective learners. Rosenblatt found no differences in impulsivity among the ethnic groups she studied.[3] On the whole, she concluded: "The Mexican-American lower class first grade boy is more impulsive or less careful on cognitive tasks than other children but does not have personality characteristics consistent with an impulsive child. He is more reserved than other children and not impulsively lively or outgoing."[4]

Werner and Evans tested the skin color preferences of forty four- and five-year-old Mexican-American children. Subjects were presented with *dolls*; "white" dolls had "yellow hair and flesh-toned [!] skin; the Negro dolls had black hair and brown skin."[1] Children who were attending preschool were more "prejudiced" in that they preferred the white dolls consistently. They also tended to say the white adult doll was larger than the black one, although both were the same size. When value choices were made, white skin was regarded as good, dark skin as bad.[2]

---

[1] Fernando Penalosa and Edward C. McDonogh, "Education, Economic Status and Social-Class Awareness of Mexican-Americans," *Phylon*, 29 (1968), 121.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 126.

[3] Joan B. Rosenblatt, *Measures of Impulse Control as Related to First Grade Children's Socio-Economic Class and Ethnic Group Background* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1968), p. 100 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-14, 514).

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 106.

The effects of ability grouping on 491 Anglo and Mexican-American sixth grade students in six schools of Albuquerque, New Mexico, were studied by Sarthory. The effects were related much more to social class and I. Q. than to ethnicity. In general, ability grouping tended to reinforce trends: It deflated already low occupational aspirations and inflated slightly those already high. It also tended to depress already low self-concepts as well as depressing slightly the high self-concepts of high I. Q. students.[3] Sarthory distinguished between the promotion and perpetuation of ill-effects upon students. Ability grouping, he found, did not create additional learning burdens for children. "Grouping does appear to perpetuate existing social cleavage, however, but along social class lines more than along ethnic lines."[4] Sarthory states that ability grouping should not be practiced in interethnic schools: "New methods of creating school attendance districts need to be developed. Present practices tend to perpetuate social and economic cleavages which are reflected in residential segregation."[5]

Anderson and associates studied classroom climates in three schools in the area of El Paso, Texas. Area I, near

---

1. Norma E. Werner and Idella M. Evans, "Perception of Prejudice in Mexican-American Preschool Children," Perceptual and Motor Skills, 27 (1968) 1041.

2. Ibid., p. 1043.

3. Joseph A. Sarthory, The Effects of Ability Grouping in Multi-Cultural School Situations (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1968), p. 137 and 149.

4. Ibid., p. 203.

5. Ibid., p. 205.

Juarez, Mexico, almost adjacent to El Paso, contained many poor immigrants who spoke Spanish almost exclusively. Area II, nearer the city proper, had fewer Mexicans; more English was spoken; fathers typically had some formal education and were employed in jobs requiring a degree of skill. Residents of Area III were for the most part, American-born families whose predominant language was English; families were smaller, and the head of the household was far more educated than was true in the other areas. The schools of each area were distinctive. In Area I, for example, were found those "teachers who express more positive attitudes toward the disadvantaged [and] also express more positive attitudes toward students in general."[1] On the other hand, while "teachers dominate the verbal behavior in [all] the classrooms studied," teachers in Area III are engaged in direction-giving to a much greater extent than are teachers in the other two areas."[2] Teachers who stress academic interests are concentrated in Areas I and II.

Five years after, Winther and associates traced the educational fortunes and misfortunes of the entering freshman Class of 1963 at the University of New Mexico. A sample of 189 (over ten percent of the class) were distributed as follows by 1968:[3]

	Spanish surname	Other
Graduated	24. 4	30. 8
Currently-enrolled	6. 1	8. 1
Dropped out	69. 5	61. 1

---

[1] James G. Anderson, William H. Johnson, and Robert Lange, *Mexican-American Students in a Metropolitan Context: Factors Affecting the Social-Emotional Climate of the Classroom*, July, 1969, p. 28 (ERIC # ED 030 521).

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 35 and 38.

[3] Sven F. Winther, E. Bruce Potter, and William H. Huber, *A Longitudinal Study of the Beginning Freshman Class of 1963 at the University of New Mexico. The Invisible Student*, May 1969, p. 24. (ERIC # ED 030 532).

Spanish-surname students made up 15.7 percent of all resident students at the university.[1] The researchers note that dropouts and failures are socially "invisible"; they simply disappear without any substantial interest shown by university authorities. Winther and associates call this an "open-bottomed" system.[2] The tradition and trend are service to the 'winners' and forget the 'losers'.... Those who come and for any reason 'do not make it' are largely left to their own devices and are explained after the fact, if at all, by 'they didn't belong here in the first place.' "[3] Special measures are only now being developed to make a beginning in this area.[4]

3. PUERTO RICANS

Rodriguez notes that "throughout many decades of mass migration, the school system of New York City has been guided by the imperative of assimilation."[5] A large-scale study by the school board, completed in 1958, failed to recommend bi-lingualism even though it went into great detail on language problems of the Puerto Rican child.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 23.

[2] Ibid., p. 38.

[3] Ibid., p. 35.

[4] On means of increasing the number of Chicanos on college campuses, see the helpful materials in Everett D. Edington, Recruitment of Spanish-Speaking Students Into Higher Education, May, 1969 (ERIC # ED 031 320); Anna Nieto Gomez and J. Anthony Vasquez, The Needs of the Chicano on the College Campus, May, 1969 (ERIC # ED 031 323); and Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Proceedings, National Conference on Educational Opportunities for Mexican Americans, 1968 (ERIC # ED 031 345).

[5] Hernan Rodriguez, Some Problems of Bilingualism in Acculturation of Puerto Ricans in New York City (Master's thesis, City College of New York, 1965), p. 93. (University Microfilms Order No. M-1153).

Weissman studied communication patterns of thirty-seven Puerto Rican and Negro children and their mothers on the Lower East Side of Manhattan. The subjects were interviewed at home and in a neighborhood settlement house. Mother-child relations of Puerto Ricans were much less stressful than for Negroes.

> ... Close to sixty percent of the Puerto Rican mother-child pairs leave the Center holding hands or very near one another. This pattern is not in evidence for the Negro group.... The Puerto Rican mothers are much less critical and the children less anxious and restless.... The Puerto Rican mothers and children showed a much more active pattern /of play/ with at least two times as many praise and pleasure interactions.[2]

Weissman observed numerous negative admonitions to their children by Negro mothers.[3]

At home, differences were also apparent.

> ... /There was/ heightened group interaction of children and parents in the homes of the Puerto Rican group. Group singing, often of religious songs, was a more frequent occurrence. When present /at the interview/, Puerto Rican fathers

---

[1] See New York City Public Schools, The Puerto Rican Study, 1953-1957: A Report on the Education and Adjustment of Puerto Rican Pupils in the Public Schools of the City of New York (N. Y.: Board of Education, 1958).

[2] Julius Weissman, An Exploratory Study of Communication Patterns of Lower-Class Negro and Puerto Rican Mothers and Pre-School Children (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966), pp. 50, 60, and 61. (University Microfilms Order No. 67-5551).

[3] Ibid., p. 54.

> more often cooperated and joined in the games, while Negro fathers tended to remain in the background.

Both Puerto Rican and Negro families were living at the poverty line.

Hertzig and associates compared aspects of cognitive functioning among three-year-olds of working class Puerto Rican and middle class mainland white backgrounds. Each of the children had been studied since it was three months old as part of a larger longitudinal study.[1] The researchers knew the children very well and excellent rapport existed. "... The preponderant response in both groups of children to cognitive demands /in a testing situation/ was to work."[2] While I. Q. score differences of Puerto Rican and mainland white children were statistically significant, the researchers considered these "probably functionally trivial."[3] In characterizing the styles of the two groups, Hertzig and associates stated: "Perhaps the most pervasive difference between the two groups was the tendency of the middle class children to respond to the cognitive demands by verbalization much more frequently than by action or gesture."[4] No evidence was found to explain this difference by the bilinguality of the Puerto Rican children.[5]

In a word, the middle-class children were far better prepared to succed in school. Their parents emphasized task-orientation and task-completion. On the other hand, in the Puerto Rican homes social interaction rather than task-completion was stressed. Puerto Rican children tended to respond less often to cognitive demands with work-responses; they tended to make fewer spontaneous extensions; and they tended to follow not-work responses with not-work behavior. There was no lack of conversation in the Puerto Rican homes. The researchers warned: "If the patterns described continue to define the developmental course of the two groups of children, they can result only in a much enhanced likelihood for school failure and underachievement in the Puerto Rican children, and for school success in the middle-class children."[1]

---

[1] Margaret E. Hertzig, Herbert G. Birch, Alexander Thomas, and Olga Aran Mendez, Class and Ethnic Differences in the Responsiveness of Preschool Children to Cognitive Demands (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1968).

[2] Ibid., p. 16.

[3] Ibid., p. 28.

[4] Ibid., p. 40.

[5] Ibid., p. 43.

Thomas, a member of the Hertzig team, also reported separately on another aspect of the long-term longitudinal study mentioned earlier. His interest was the intellectual development of forty-five Puerto Rican children. Their greatest intellectual handicap was a reading deficit. This could not be explained by any feature of the home. Thomas found "no consistent relationship between parental child care practices or educational attitudes and the children's reading deficits."[2]

> ... The basic causes of the reading deficit found in most of these Puerto Rican children must be sought outside the home. The parents manifest a high degree of interest and involvement in their children's school careers. They are concerned about academic achievement. Yet even those children in the normal range of I. Q. and higher are reading below grade level. It would appear that the main source of the reading deficit is not the home but the school.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 47

[2] Alexander Thomas, Retardation in Intellectual Development of Lower-Class Puerto Rican Children in New York City (New York: New York University Medical Center, May 31, 1969), p. 61.

[3] Ibid., p. 4.

Two-thirds of the parents want their children to finish college, only about one-third expect them to do so, and only one-fifth have specific plans for financing college attendance.[1]

The everyday environment of these Puerto Rican children is experientially rich. Their intellectual ability does not decline over the years, even in the absence of suitable educational opportunities. Yet, one must compare Thomas' basic point with that made by Hertzig and associates. The latter noted that "differences in behavior between middle class and Puerto Rican children develop long before exposure to formal learning in school or experience in nursery school."[2] They predict school failure if certain trends are not changed. Thomas apparently disagrees with this orientation but he does not take explicit issue with it. A clarification would be helpful.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Many of the educational disabilities which burden Indian Americans and Mexican-Americans are shared by Negro Americans. It is important to realize that belonging to an ethnic minority in America and being poor besides creates a common plight. Many parallels can be seen in studies of self-concept, response to desegregation, and rising aspirations. If we add to poverty a continuing cultural segregation, the common plight becomes clearer. The urban Negro ghetto is re-enacted, with even greater injury, on the isolated remotely-controlled Indian reservation. The factor of a "foreign" language--Spanish--becomes, instead of a link, a barrier. Yet, research reveals realistic methods to develop the potential of isolated minorities and permit them to live fruitfully with other children.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 14-15.

[2] Hertzig and Associates, Class and Ethnic Differences, p. 44.

CHAPTER 7

TWO FEDERAL REPORTS

This chapter is devoted to an analysis of two studies conducted by federal agencies: (1) the Equal Educational Opportunity Survey, by the United States Office of Education and (2) Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, by the United States Commission on Civil Rights.[1]

1. THE EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES SURVEY

During congressional debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1964, virtually no attention was paid Section 402 requiring that

> The Commissioner /of Education/ shall conduct a survey and make a report to the President and the Congress, within two years of the enactment of this title, concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

In the final design of the study, the factor of religion was omitted. In July, 1966, two full years after passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the United States Office of Education published a single volume reporting the principal results of its survey;[1] a second volume was released with many statistical materials.[2] The report documented extensive inequality of educational opportunity. In the present work, however, we shall restrict our attention to material relating to possible learning effects of desegregation. Although the co-directors of the study were James S. Coleman and Ernest Q. Campbell, the project was very much a collective one and so we refer to it as the Office of Education study.

---

[1] James S. Coleman and others, Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966); U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967).

Let us examine the major findings in the same order in which we discussed parallel subject matter in the preceding chapters. The general order of topics is: (A) desegregation and achievement; (B) aspiration and self-concept; (C) relations with other students and teachers; (B) role of the family; and (E) non-Negro minorities.

A. Desegregation and Achievement.

The findings on the subject are as follows:[3]

1. ... As the proportion white in a school increases, the achievement of students in each racial group increases.
2. ... This relationship increases as grade in school increases.
3. The higher achievement of all racial and ethnic groups in schools with greater proportions of white students is largely, perhaps wholly, related to effects associated with the student body's educational background and aspirations rather than with better facilities and curriculum.
4. ... Average test performance /for Negroes/ increases as

---

[1] James S. Coleman, Ernest Q. Campbell, Carol J. Hobson, James McPartland, Alexander M. Mood, Frederick D. Weinfeld, and Robert L. York, Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967).

[2] U. S. Office of Education, Supplemental Appendix to the Survey on Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966).

[3] Equality of Educational Opportunity, pp. 307 and 331.

the proportion of white classmates increases....

5. Those students who first entered desegregated schools in the early grades do generally show slightly higher average scores than the students who first came to desegregated schools in later grades.

Each of these findings had been reached earlier by at least one researcher.

B. Aspiration and self-concept.

Aspiration, interest in school, and "motivation" were found to be especially high among Negro students.[1] Negro and white were found to have equally high self-esteem.[2] Related to the latter is the pupil's sense of control of his environment. Negroes and other minorities ranked lower than whites on this measure.[3] The researchers found there was interaction between these three elements.[4]

> For each /ethnic group/, as the proportion white in the school increases, the child's sense of control of environment increases, and his self-concept decreases.... The parents' desires for the child's further education have the largest unique contribution to positive self-concept and a sense of control of environment.

"Sense of control of environment" was measured by three yardsticks:
(1) the respondent's belief in hard work rather than in good luck for success; (2) feeling that others are not getting in one's way when one tries to get ahead; and (3) a belief that "people like me have a chance to be successful in life." Whites scored significantly higher on the first measure and less so on the latter two. Sense of control was not treated in any of

---

[1] Equality of Educational Opportunity, p. 280.
[2] Ibid., p. 281.
[3] Ibid., p. 289.
[4] Ibid., pp. 323-324.

the research previously reviewed in the present work. However, in Meketon's study, described in Chapter 3, Negro children who desegregated school "C" demonstrated a high sense of control of reality and yet experienced a higher sense of self-esteem than other Negro children who remained in an all-Negro school.[1] In Singer's study, the highest achieving Negro students in a desegregated school had the highest self-regard. In any case, the Office of Education researchers themselves suggest that the above interrelationship between desegregation, self-concept, and sense of control may not be an effect of integration, and that in any case the magnitudes involved are small.

C. Relation with Students and Teachers.

The Office of Education study does not deal systematically with the quality of relationships between Negro and white students. Some of a series of case studies of desegregation recall earlier studies. This is especially so for the study of the University of Delaware.[2]

The study reached several conclusions on the importance of teachers in understanding achievement differentials between schools and students. Perhaps the most significant of these was the following:[3]

> The apparent effect of average teacher characteristics for children in a given group is directly related to the "sensitivity" of the group to the school environment.... Good teachers matter more for children from minority groups which have educationally deficient backgrounds. It suggests as well that for any groups whether minority or not, the effect of good teachers is greatest upon the children who suffer most educational disadvantage in their background, and that a given investment in upgrading teacher

---

[1] See Chapter 3, p. 89.

[2] Ibid., pp. 488-489.

[3] Ibid., p. 317; see, also, p. 297.

> quality will have most effect on achievement in underprivileged areas.

It will be recalled that Geisel also pointed out the more personal meaning school and teachers have for the Negro child.[1] Katz, as we saw in Chapter 4, supplies a theoretical framework within which it is possible to view the dynamics of the Office of Education finding.

D. Role of the Family.

The Office of Education survey regards the school-to-school variations in student achievement to be explained principally by "variations in family backgrounds of the entering student bodies."[2] From ten to twenty-five percent of variances in individual achievement can be accounted for by family background factors.[3] As the child progresses in school, objective family background factors decreases in importance; included among these are size and intactness of family, reading material in home, parents' education and the like. Subjective family background factors, however, become increasingly important to the school child; such factors include parents' interest in school and their educational aspirations for their children. It was inferred that for some reason Negro parents are not succeeding in translating their high interest in school progress "into practices that support the child's achievement."[4] (There was no effort to discover whether this difficulty was related in any way to the school's role.) The study apparently did not inquire into the saliency of subjective family background factors under varying degrees of desegregation. Also, the study did not examine the general relation of the family to student desegregation.

E. Non-Negro Minorities.

Data were collected and presented for Mexican-

---

[1] See Chapter 3, p. 71.

[2] Equality of Educational Opportunity, p. 296.

[3] Ibid., p. 299.

[4] Ibid., p. 302.

Americans, Puerto Ricans, Indian Americans, Oriental Americans, as well as Negroes and whites. All basic tables include data on all ethnic groups. (A separate publication consolidates much of the data on Mexican-Americans.) In the study, numerous comparisons are made among the minorities. Unfortunately, no benchmark for measuring change is presented and so it is not possible to judge the direction and pace of any changes that may be implicit in the data.

F. The Importance of Desegregation.

The study found intra-school differences in achievement to be much larger than inter-school differences. From five percent (Oriental Americans) to thirty-one percent (Indian Americans) of the total difference in achievement can be attributed to differences between schools. For most school children the range is around ten (white) to twenty (Negro) percent.[1] The remainder of variation in achievement originates in factors outside all schools and factors entirely within individual schools. The former are those related to family background; the latter, to a combination of in-school factors: (a) characteristics of the student body, (b) school facilities and curriculum, (c) teachers' characteristics, and (d) attitudes of students.

As we saw above, the study attributes from ten to twenty-five percent of achievement test scores variation to family background factors. Turning to factors within the schools, the study observes that "attributes of other students account for far more variation in the achievement of minority group children than do any attributes of school facilities and slightly more than do attributes of staff."[2] Earlier, we listed the study's findings as to the relationship of achievement and integration. The relationships were sizable and significant. While they were reduced in size when the socio-economic status of students was controlled, "the /students'/

---

1. Equality of Educational Opportunity, p. 296.
2. Ibid., p. 302.

performance in integrated schools and in schools integrated longer remains higher. Thus, although the differences are small, and although the degree of integration within the school is not known, there is evidently, even in the short run, an effect of school integration on the reading and mathematics achievement of Negro pupils."[1] A distinctly modest achievement effect is thus attributed to desegregation.

G. Criticisms of the Office of Education Study.

The Equal Educational Opportunity Study is the largest, most criticized, defended, and interpreted study of its kind.[2] At the same time, the debate around it goes on

---

[1] Ibid., p. 29.

[2] See Irene Albert and Pamela Sheldon, "Equality of Educational Opportunity," Educational Leadership, December, 1966; Joseph Alsop, "Reaction to the Coleman Report," N. E. A. Journal, September, 1967; David Blumenthal, "Coleman Report Brings Revolution, No Solution," Harvard Crimson, November 28, 1967; Samuel Bowles and Henry M. Levin, Equality of Educational Opportunity--A Critical Appraisal, 1967; James S. Coleman, The Concept of Educational Opportunity, paper read at a conference at the Harvard University Graduate School of Education, October 21, 1967; Coleman "Toward Open Schools," Public Interest, Fall, 1967; Coleman, "Equal Schools or Equal Students?" Public Interest, Summer, 1966; Robert A. Dentler, "Equality of Educational Opportunity--A Special Review," Urban Review, December, 1966; Henry S. Dyer, Social Factors and Equal Educational Opportunity, paper presented before the American Psychological Association, September 3, 1967; Edmund W. Gordon, "Equalizing Educational Opportunity in the Public School," IRCD Bulletin, November, 1967; Meg Greenfield, "What Is Racial Balance in the Schools?" Reporter, March 23, 1967; Christopher Jencks, "Education: The Racial Gap," New Republic, October 1, 1966; Irwin Katz, Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools? The Policy Implications of Research, unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U. S. Commission on

Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967; Katz (Reply to review by Nichols in December 9, 1966 issue of *Science*), *Science,* May 13, 1967; Sandra C. Koslin, *Education and Urban Society,* 2 (1969) 119-121; George W. Mayeske, Frederic D. Weinfeld, and Albert E. Beaton, Jr., *Item Response Analyses of the Educational Opportunities Survey Teacher Questionnaire,* Analytical Note No. 59 (Washington, D. C.: Division of Operations Analysis, National Center for Educational Statistics, May 18, 1967; Floyd McKissick, "Is Integration Necessary?" *New Republic,* December 3, 1966; Deborah Meier, "The Coleman Report," *Integrated Education,* December, 1967; Alexander M. Mood, Murray Spitzer, David S. Stoller, and Frederic D. Weinfeld, "Are Better Schools Better?" *Science,* May 12, 1967; Robert C. Nichols, "Schools and the Disadvantaged," *Science,* December 9, 1966; Nichols, (Rejoinder to letters by Katz, Mood, and others) *Science,* May 12, 1967: Thomas F. Pettigrew, *The Consequences of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools: Another Look,* unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967; Pettigrew, *Race and Equal Educational Opportunity,* unpublished paper presented before the American Psychological Association, September 3, 1967; William H. Sewell, Leonard A. Marascuilo, and Harold W. Pfautz, Review Symposium on the Equal Educational Opportunity Survey, *American Sociological Review,* June, 1967; U. S. Congress, 89th, 2nd session, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, *Federal Role in Urban Affairs, Hearings,* Parts 2 and 6 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), testimony of John W. Gardner and Harold Howe II in Part 2; see, also, letters to Senator Abraham Ribicoff from Ernest Q. Campbell, James S. Coleman, and Harold Howe II, Part 2, pp. 343, 344, 348-349, and letter from Campbell to Senator Albert Gore in Part 6; U. S. Office of Education, *Supplemental Appendix to the Survey on Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966).

almost completely isolated from previous research in the field. The best-informed popular discussions of the study proceed as though either the previous research is not worth reviewing or does not even exist. But the study itself does scarcely more than this. It cites only two specific studies (Katz, 1964, and Wilson, 1959), both described in earlier chapters). In addition, the report occasionally refers vaguely to "previous research," when it approves, and to "writers, when it disapproves. Only two participants in the debate have used other research and named it--Pettigrew and Katz. The others seem committed to the idea that the issues dealt with in the study stand or fall on the findings of the study. This is far from the case.

Following is a list of the principal criticisms of the Office of Education study, that have appeared thus far in the literature.

1. Methodological
    (a) Failed to study and evaluate roles of administration and of the organized community. (Gordon)
    (b) Studied less important school factors such as facilities, offerings, and teacher qualifications instead of more consequential factors such as "pupil-teacher interaction, teacher expectation, classroom climate, pupil-pupil interaction, and the types and demands of the learning experiences available." (Gordon)
    (c) "... Its thoughtlessness is a function of a certain degree of mindless empiricism and often patent lack of 'acquaintance with' the objects of study; these lead to instances of naive operationalism and a tendency to swallow factitious and blatantly nonsensical results all too gullibly." (Pfautz)

2. Procedural
    (a) The sample:
        (1) Is unrepresentative of very large cities (Sewell, Bowles, and Levin)
        (2) Is inadequate because of the high non-response

rate from school systems and on student questionnaires. (Bowles and Levin)

  - (b) Coding of questionnaire responses was poorly done. (Bowles and Levin)
  - (c) Linear regression technique was ill-adapted to problems studied (Bowles and Levin)
  - (d) Socioeconomic status was not effectively controlled. (Nichols)

3. Substantive
  - (a) Study underestimated actual inequality of educational opportunity. (Gordon)
  - (b) Per-pupil expenditures are far more unequal than the study suggests. (Bowles and Levin)
  - (c) The integration-effect on achievement is actually a social-class effect. (Bowles and Levin, Nichols)
  - (d) The school-effect on achievement is much less than the study indicates. (Sewell)

Following are some comments on these criticisms:

1. Methodological Criticisms.

These criticisms are judgments about "what might have been." Gordon's points are extremely well taken. The study utilized traditional and manipulable categories. At the same time it shied away from expressing an opinion about the quality of schooling other than by reference to achievement scores of individual students. The schools, indeed, come out of all this in so neutral and helpless a stance that one wonders where future change is to originate. Pfautz seems to be arguing with the field of educational research; as for lack of acquaintance with the object of study, this was evidently true in at least the matter of per-pupil expenditures, discussed below.

2. Procedural Criticims.

The weakness of the sample is all too evident. Let us take the problem of inadequate coverage. Very likely the sample is lopsided in its failure to include many of the largest cities. As a result, those school systems with the largest Negro student bodies are, in fact, underrepresented. The evidence for this is indirect. Sewell points out that the big cities are the locus of the greatest between-school differences in achievement: accordingly, their omission could well have created the appearance of small between-school differences.

The defective sample cannot be charged to the Office of Education. A number of large city school systems refused to participate; an organized campaign was conducted by school officials to discourage participation. According to unverified press reports, Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, Buffalo, Syracuse, Long Beach, Columbus, Cincinnati, and Boston were among the non-participants. James Coleman, co-director of the study, observed that eight cities in which the NAACP had filed a suit against the school board refused to participate in the testing. "School superintendents," Coleman said, "have become much more sensitive about these kinds of problems."[1]

Another line of criticism can focus on several items in the study that indicate that a number of city school systems enrolling numerous ghetto children were omitted. In a special compilation, Mayeske, Weinfeld, and Beaton report that fewer than two percent of the teachers responding to item 35 on the teacher's questionnaire were substitutes. (In Chicago, the figure is now nearly twenty-five percent; in Washington, D.C., it is over thirty percent.) In the main report, it is stated that "on the whole, Negro pupils are not instructed by less experienced teachers, nor by those newer to the current school" and that "faculties are somewhat more stable in schools attended by Negroes." However representative these conditions are in some cities, they are most unlikely in large urban centers.

Katz contends that socioeconomic factors were substantially controlled so that the report's claims on this count are defensible.

3. Substantive Criticisms.

Let us examine the matter of per-pupil expenditures.

---

1. Quoted in Integrated Education, December, 1965-January, 1966, p.4.

2. Equality of Educational Opportunity, pp. 137 and 164.

Bowles and Levin charge that "the measure used in the Report was an average of expenditure per student within an entire district. School to school differences _within_ a district... were simply ignored."[1] Thus, a bias was said to be imparted to the data and the lower expenditures for disadvantaged schools were therefore said to be understated. For verification, the reader is referred by Bowles and Levin to a recent study by Jesse Burkhead as well as an older one by Patricia C. Sexton.[2] In fact, however, Burkhead does not verify the generalization by Bowles and Levin. Instead, he states: "The Chicago resource allocation patterns for public schools do not follow the patterns revealed in Patricia Cayo Sexton's study of Large City /Detroit/, where she found that the upper-income schools were favored in terms of all-important categories of unputs."[3] (Burkhead used Atlanta and Chicago budget data as his principal evidence.)

Nevertheless, it would appear that both the Office of Education study and the Bowles-Levin critique suffer from the same defect: They assume that budget _allocations_ and _expenditures_ are the same. It is the rare large-city school system that publishes a detailed record of expenditures as against allocations. Even if the study had used school-by-school, rather than district-wide, allocations, an additional measure of realism would have been gained. Many problems, however, would still remain.

Data about teacher salaries, the single largest item in any school budget and thus in per-pupil expenditures, were collected on an individual - teacher basis (question number 32 of the Teacher's questionnaire) as well as on a system-wide basis (question number 36B and 41B of the Superintendent's Questionnaire). Presumably, if the study used the former source, then--according to the logic of Bowles and Levin--important school to school differences should have been demonstrated. Because results were not reported for single schools or subgroups of schools, one cannot easily decide the matter. However, the study declared:[1]

---

[1] Bowles and Levin, p.26 (emphasis in original).

[2] See Jesse Burkhead with Thomas G. Fox and John W. Holland, _Input and Output in Large-City High Schools_ (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1967) and Sexton, _Education and Income_ (New York: Viking, 1961).

[3] Burkhead, p. 59.

> When we compare Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Indian, and Oriental-American students with whites in their same counties, there are few differences. Most of the relationships approximate those between whites and Negroes. In teachers' salary, there are no differences by race of student that exceeded $100 annually....

How can this apparent equality be accounted for?

First, by the entire survey's underrepresentation of large school systems in which very sizable salary differences are allocated in the budget to various types of schools. A large school system with one-quarter substitutes will have to allocate lower salaries to those schools where the substitutes teach. In the large cities, this means especially schools in which Negro students predominate. This fact simply does not surface in the Office of Education study.

Second, the study confuses prices with costs. Salaries are prices, but costs of teachers include prices other than salaries alone. Nowadays, for example, fringe benefits are an important non-wage supplement. The survey collected information on this kind of expenditure from superintendents--although it did not designate what part represented teacher fringes--but not from individual teachers. What is the magnitude of fringe benefits and how do these play a role in inequality of educational opportunity? Recently, an experienced official in the New York City schools declared:[1]

---

1. Equality of Educational Opportunity, p. 164.

2. Jacob Landers, Testimony at Public Hearing on "Education in New York City for Low Income Youngsters," November 16, 1967, pp. 21-22.

> A beginning substitute teacher costs $6,200 plus 7% in fringe benefits for a total cost of $6,634. A teacher on maximum costs $12,600 plus 30% in fringe benefits for a total cost of $16,380.... This fact would be unimportant if teachers at different levels of service, licensing and educational preparation were distributed equally among the schools.... The fact is that these levels are unequally distributed throughout the school system. It is a matter of common knowledge... that the schools for poor children have fewer experienced teachers and more substitutes.

Let us examine these figures.

Suppose one school were to be staffed entirely with substitutes at beginning pay, and another with teachers at maximum step on the salary schedule; assume two schools employing thirty-five teachers and serving 1,000 students each. Total teacher costs in the first school would be $232,190 or $232.19 per pupil; in the second school, teacher costs would be $573,330 or $573.33 per pupil. While few, if any, schools in reality duplicate these figures, a number approximate them. Interestingly, the author of the above quotation states that to the best of his knowledge no study of actual staff costs has been made in New York City. Lacking such studies, a cloud of unreality envelops discussion and research on inequalities of educational opportunity.

A final comment on quantity of school expenditure. In 1960, Sexton found, "Chicago was spending slightly more than $300 per pupil per year for instruction in the elementary schools."[1] "Obviously," she added, "you cannot come within a thousand miles of giving an adequate education to a slum child for $300 a year.... It is a travesty to think we can." In 1967, a federal court in Washington, D.C., found the city's school board in violation of the equal protection clause of the

---

[1] Patricia Cayo Sexton, Comments on Three Cities," Integrated Education, August, 1963, p. 31.

Fourteenth Amendment in part on evidence that a per pupil expenditure differential of $100 existed between predominantly Negro and predominantly white schools; virtually all the differential was shown to consist of teacher-salary differences.[1]

Gordon's methodological comment bears directly on the matter just reviewed: "School factors may have been found to be of relatively modest importance for all pupils not because what the schools can do is not crucial but because... [the study] did not look at what the schools actually do." Certain additional substantive criticisms of the study will be dealt with in the latter half of this chapter.

In summary, the Office of Education study verified once more research findings that had already been established repeatedly that social class integration benefited achievement and that, to a lesser extent, racial desegregation had the same kind of effect. Undoubtedly, the report spoke ambiguously on the exact interrelationship of class and race. The report is less useful as a representation of everyday reality in America's schoolrooms.

The National Center for Educational Statistics undertook further analyses of the data after completion of the Office of Education Study in 1966. This project will be published in a volume entitled A Study of Our Nation's Schools.[2]

2. THE RACIAL ISOLATION STUDY

In November, 1965, eight months before the Office of Education study was completed, President Johnson requested the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights to prepare a report on remedies for racial isolation in the schools inasmuch as "it has become apparent that such isolation presents serious barriers to quality education." In February, 1967, the report was completed and entitled Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. Thomas F. Pettigrew served as a chief consultant for the study.

---

[1] See Hobson v Hansen, Congressional Record, June 21, 1967, pp. H7655-H7697.

[2] George W. Mayeske, Carl E. Wisler, Albert E. Beaton, Jr., Frederic D. Weinfeld, Wallace M. Cohen, Tetsuo Okada, John M. Proshek, and Kenneth A. Tabler, A Study of our Nation's Schools. A Working Paper (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, (1970?).

The Racial Isolation study was concerned with the causes, extent, effects, and remedy of school segregation. We shall examine only the material dealing with effects.

The Commission employed five research approaches. First, and most important, was a re-analysis of basic data gathered by the Office of Education study. It should be noted that the re-analysis was of the data on tapes and not of the findings by the Office. In a real sense, this part of the Racial Isolation project is a new study in its own right. Second, a longitudinal study was made of Richmond, California. Third, an analysis was made of 1965 high school graduates in Oakland, California; we reviewed this study in Chapter 2. Fourth, a study was made of long-term effects of desegregated schooling upon adult attitudes; we shall examine this study in Chapter 7. Fifth, a series of special studies, concerning mostly specific locations, were commissioned. Reference to one of these, by Stout and Inger, was made in Chapter 2. In addition, the Commission research staff undertook special assignments.

Let us examine the study in the order of topics utilized earlier in this chapter.

A. Desegregation and Achievement.

1. Re-analysis of the Office of Education data.

James McPartland and Robert L. York supervised this part of the study.[1] A principal problem was to disentangle the effects of race and social class upon achievement. This relationship had been left somewhat indistinct in the Office of Education study. In reviewing achievement scores, McPartland and York determined that "there is a positive association of achievement scores with the racial composition of the classroom, no matter what the racial composition of the school may be."[1] Is this simply an effect of social class? The researchers found that even when "holding constant the social class of the student and his school, there remains an upward trend in average achievement level as the proportion of white classmates increases."[2]

---

[1] See Appendix C1, "Further Analysis of Equality of Educational Opportunity," in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 35-142.

Thus, an inconsistency appeared between this finding and that of the Office of Education study. In the latter, racial desegregation was accorded a minor role; in the Commission study, it is seen as major. McPartland and York suggest two reasons for the inconsistency: (1) the statistical technique used in the earlier study tended to confound class and race; and (2) the earlier study, in applying the regression analysis, used the school rather than the classroom as its object of analysis. Yet, stress McPartland and York, "it is in the classroom within the achool where the characteristics of the fellow-students have their effects."[3] Negro students in a segregated classroom, for example, do not benefit even if the school as a whole is racially balanced. The research design employed by the Office of Education did not permit the making of such a distinction.

2. The Richmond, California Study

This study was directed by Alan B. Wilson.[4] He concluded that "racial composition of the school, while tending to favor Negro students in racially integrated schools, does not have a substantial effect--not nearly so strong as the social-class composition of the school.[5] In its turn, social class composition of the school had more effect on Negro than white students. While Wilson arrived at a similar finding on several different tests, he noted that "there are hardly any Negroes in our sample in predominantly white schools or predominantly upper /social/ status schools."[1] As a result, a test could not be made across-the-board, so to speak; i.e., the Richmond Negro sample was too small to enable Wilson to test the relation of social class and race under all conditions of color and racial composition of schools. It should also be noted that Wilson used the school rather than the classroom as the unit of analysis.[2] Possibly the McPartland-York revision of the Office of Education weighting of social class and race might find its parallel in Wilson's analysis if classrooms rather than school were studied. Meanwhile, there is no obvious reason to predict that this would, in fact, be the case.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 38.

[2] Ibid., p.40.

[3] Ibid., p. 42.

[4] See Appendix C3, "Educational Consequences of Segregation in a California Community," in ibid., II, pp. 165-206.

[5] Ibid., p. 186.

3. Racial Isolation Staff

The Commission staff held that "at each level of teacher quality and school social class, the performance of Negro students is substantially higher in majority-white than majority Negro schools."[3] Wilson had not found this to be the case, perhaps because, as noted above, he did not have a large enough sample. The Commission staff, however, had access to a larger sample, i.e., the national sample being restudied by McPartland and York. This sample consisted of low-ability Negro students; Wilson had lacked sufficient such representation in his sample to test under varying school conditions. The Commission staff controlled social class of students and found: "... The achievement of disadvantaged Negro students in the lowest achieving schools increases in majority-white classrooms. The trend grows stronger as the average achievement level of the school rises."[1] (The logic of this conclusion can be better understood, perhaps, if the reader reviews the findings of McPartland's study in Chapter 2.)

---

[1] Ibid., p. 184.

[2] This criticism as well as others are made in Thomas F. Pettigrew, The Consequences of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools: Another Look, unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities sponsored by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967, pp. 9-11.

[3] Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, I, pp.98-99.

B. Aspiration of Self-Concept.

1. The Armor Study

David Armor conducted a special study of the educational aspirations of Negro students.[2] He found that lower-class boys of high ability aspired higher in integrated than in segregated schools. (On the contrary, lower-class whites who are in predominantly Negro schools aspire a bit higher in such schools than in integrated schools.) "For the Negro male," concludes Armor, "it is the qualified, bright student from a lower class background and in a more deprived school, who is aided most by integration...."[3] This is getting the help where it is most needed. Negro lower-class girls in lower-class schools, on the other hand, aspire a bit higher in segregated schools. Armor does not suggest an explanation for this contradiction. In an earlier study, Fichter had reported that the Negro woman student in segregated Negro colleges "has the highest aspirations as a freshman but plummets the farthest in lower aspirations as a senior."[4] Fichter's explanation concerned the deepening realization of Negro women of the heavy support they will probably have to supply and the consequent adjustment to this to the detriment of their educational aspirations.

2. The Richmond Study

---

[1] Ibid., p. 102.

[2] See Appendix C2, "The Racial Composition of Schools and College Aspiration of Negro Students," Ibid., II, pp. 143-164.

[3] Ibid., p. 146.

[4] Joseph H. Fichter, Negro Women Bachelors. A Comparative Exploration of the Experiences and Expectations of College Graduates of the Class of June, 1961 (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, January, 1965), p.6.

Wilson found that "far more Negro students than whites of similar achievement levels, want to go to college."[1] This is especially true of lower-achieving, lower-class Negro students. He also found that Negro students "report slightly higher perception of their academic ability than whites."[2] On the other hand, they tended to believe that they were incapable of getting better grades and that they could not control their fate. Their perception of a hostile environment accounted for both attitudes; as Wilson puts it, they tended to discount low grades as resulting from teacher prejudice and felt that the odds against them were too high for their own actions to change much.

3. Racial Isolation Staff

The Racial Isolation report stated:[3]

> Children from poorer backgrounds are less likely than children from well-to-do backgrounds to have concrete and definite plans for college. They also are less likely to have followed through on their aspirations by contacting a college official or reading a college catalogue.

Where there is a Negro majority, those students who have the most educated teachers also have the highest educational aspirations. On the other hand, Negro students in majority white schools "are more likely to have definite college plans than similar situated students in majority-Negro schools, regardless of the quality of their teachers."[4]

In racially isolated schools, according to the Commission, low self-esteem is the rule.[5] Negro students in these schools "often doubt their own worth, and their teachers frequently corroborate these doubts."[6] These observations seem to be based on previous research and case studies rather than on an analysis of survey data. Previous research, however, tends to establish rather that high self-esteem is frequently found among students in segregated schools (Blake, Meketon, and others). The interpretation of these high self-esteem scores presents a real problem.

---

[1] Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II, p. 193.

[2] Ibid., p. 192.

[3] Ibid., I, p. 81.

[4] Ibid., pp. 99-100 (emphasis added).

[5] Ibid., p. 104.

[6] Ibid., p. 106.

C. Students in School.

1. Racial Isolation Staff

Students of both races who attend desegregated schools do not automatically modify their attitudes toward one another. As the Commission states:[1]

> ... School desegregation has its greatest impact upon student attitudes and preferences through the mediating influence of friendship with students of the other race. Negro and white students who attend school with each other, but have no friends of the other race, are less likely to prefer desegregated situations than students in desegregated schools who have such friends. Having attended schools with students of the other race and having friends of the other race contribute to preferences for desegregation. The effect is strongest for students who have had both experiences.

Attendance at desegregated schools remains an influence in a person's life long after he has left school.

A separate study was made of the relationship of interracial tensions in the school to Negro achievement and attitudes. The findings showed that Negro achievement was higher where tensions were least. McPartland and York observe: "Negro student achievement and attitudes in desegregated classes are related to the degree of interracial tension within the school."[2] They neglect, however, to observe that more or less the same is true in segregated classes.[1] McPartland and York also found that interracial tension varied with the number of children who had previously experienced desegregated schooling. Interracial friendships were more frequent among Negro students active in extra-curricular events.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 111.

[2] Ibid., II, p. 42.

The researchers conclude:[2]

> ... There is indeed an effect of desegregated schooling which results from the racial composition of the classroom, apart from the changes in social class level of the fellow students which often accompanies desegregation. The differences seem to be well explained by the racial associations of the student, which are much more a function of the racial composition of the classroom than either the student's social class or the social class level of the schools.

This finding is fully in accord with much earlier research.

2. Richmond, California, Study

Wilson studies the relation of social class factors to the development of delinquency among his Richmond sample. He found that "fifty-three percent of the Negro adolescent boys and twenty-six percent of the white adolescent boys have official police records of offenses during the two years prior to the administration of the questionnaire."[3] Negroes are more likely to come from broken homes, but in the Richmond study, broken homes were found to be unrelated to delinquency. In the matter of educational attainment, however, the relationship is strong: "... Negroes are much less likely than whites to do well in school, and those who do poorly in school are much more likely to have police records, whether white or Negro..."[4] Why is this so?

---

[1] See Table 6, I , ibid., p.93.

[2] Ibid., p. 43.

[3] Ibid., II, p. 199.

[4] Ibid.,

Wilson contends that lack of school success weakens the stake youths have in the school, family, and other institutions. They cease being sources of affection, involvement, and commitment for the future. Wilson summarizes: "The student who does poorly in school is less likely to like school, less likely to be involved in school activities, less likely to accept the school's authority, and less likely to see school as relevant to his future."[1] Socially segregated schools make matters worse, for "there is a substantial and significant difference in rates of official delinquency between the boys who attended predominantly middle-class junior high schools and those who went to lower-class schools...."[2] Wilson speculates that the segregation effect is an expression of the greater police surveillance that obtains in lower-class areas of the inner city. Because Negroes are disproportionately lower class, the segregation effect has a greater impact on them.

D. Non-Negro Minorities.

In requesting a study of racial isolation to be made by the Commission, President Johnson specified the subject matter as Negro and white children. Accordingly, the study did not concern itself with Puerto Rican, Mexican-American, Indian-American, or Oriental-American children.

E. The Role of Compensatory Education.

In Wilson's study of Richmond, he concluded:[3]

> The large initial difference in social inheritance of children entering school are not perceptibly ameliorated by standard school programs of remedial reading, special classes for the mentally retarded,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 201.

[2] Ibid. For a closely related theory, see Walter E. Schafer and Kenneth Polk, "Delinquency and the Schools," Appendix M in the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, (1967).

[3] Ibid., II, p. 203.

> which takes place in segregated schools, and grouped classes within schools. Investments into compensatory programs should be designed to make cumulative increments to knowledge about the development of competence.

Thus, socially isolated schools failed to remedy the learning deficit of lower-class children, Negro and white.

The Commission sought to discover whether this finding applied (a) to racial isolation as well, and (b) to a sample of large cities. It proceeded to compare the achievement of Negro students in majority-Negro schools with and without compensatory education programs; it also compared achievement by the former students with that by Negro students in majority-white schools without compensatory programs. The first comparision sought to measure the specific achievement effect of compensatory programs; the second to measure which achievement effect was greater--that of compensatory education or that of desegregation? All compensatory programs were evaluated by their own criteria of success in achieving growth in a cognitive skill. Only those programs were studied which had run their course and had been formally evaluated. One final note: Wilson stated that ordinary school remedial measures had not succeeded; he did not go to speculate on what extraordinary measures might accomplish, even in a segregated context.

Compensatory programs in majority-Negro schools were found not to have accomplished their goals. No statistically significant--and in some cases, even measurable--difference could be found between the achievement of compensated and non-compensated children in almost all the projects. As for comparative progress under isolated compensation and desegregation, the Commission found that in Syracuse, Seattle, Berkeley, and Philadelphia, the desegregated Negro children in majority-white schools had made greater achievement gains than the children in compensatory programs in majority-Negro schools.

Essentially, the Commission reached two conclusions on compensatory education: (1) as it is presently organized, it has failed; and (2) there are two reasons why it has failed:

(a) it is conducted in a racially isolated framework, and (b) it is inadequately financed, thus preventing significant improvements in learning conditions. Whether or not compensatory programs can ever succeed is, therefore, in large part a practical matter according to the Commission.[1]

> ... Efforts to improve a child's self-esteem cannot be wholly productive in a student environment which seems to deny his worth.... The compensatory programs reviewed here appear to suffer from the defect inherent in attempting to solve problems stemming in part from racial and social class isolation in schools which themselves are isolated by race and social class.

It was thought improbable that compensatory programs in a socially and racially isolated framework could ever succeed in the absence of enormous expenditures.[2]

3. APPRAISAL OF THE TWO FEDERAL REPORTS

Katz has stated:[3]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 138-139.

[2] See David K. Cohen, "Policy for the Public Schools," *Harvard Educational Review,* Winter, 1968. See, also, Edmund W. Gordon and Adelaide Jablonsky, *Compensatory Education in the Equalization of Educational Opportunity*, unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, Sponsored by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967; and *Ghetto Schools* (Washington, D.C.: New Republic Magazine, 1967).

[3] Irwin Katz, *Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools? The Policy Implications of Research*, unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities sponsored by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Novermber 16-18, 1967, p. 1.

> The dominant fact that emerges from the recent research endeavors of the U.S. Office of Education and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, is that educational opportunity is greater in racially balanced than in racially isolated schools. These historic studies show beyond any reasonable doubt that the academic attainments of both white and Negro pupils are significantly higher in majority-white classrooms than in majority-Negro classrooms.

As we saw in Chapter 4, Katz has also emphasized that whether racially-balanced classrooms will exert a favorable influence on the performance of minority-group students depends upon the school's ability to create "an atmosphere of genuine respect and acceptance."[1]

The Racial Isolation study can all too easily be misinterpreted in accordance with a kind of statistical determinism. That is, desegregation and integration can be represented as depending upon a mere statistical distribution of Negro and white children. Katz has counteracted this tendency by plumbing the psychological dynamics of desegregation. Pettigrew has followed the same policy.

Systematic critiques of the Racial Isolation study are still non-existent. The Bowles-Levin critique of the Office of Education study also charged that because the Commission study failed to control adequately the factor of social class, it could not demonstrate the autonomous contribution of race. Pettigrew has replied to this criticism.[2]

The studies of the Office of Education and Commission on Civil Rights mark the conclusion of a long first stage in the history of research on desegregation. A field has been staked out; it has now gone through two reconnaissances.

By far most of the subjects treated in both studies had already been dealt with earlier. Many of the same specific conclusions had already been reached in earlier research. Both in scale and scope, however, the two federal studies are new factors. In addition, the scientific resourcefulness of the Racial Isolation study is especially outstanding.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 26.

[2] Pettigrew, The Consequences of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools: Another Look, footnote 10, pp. 26-27. See, also, Robert C. Nichols, American Education Research Journal, 5 (1968) 700-707.

4. THE USES OF RESEARCH

A question has arisen as to whether white children in a majority Negro classroom can learn as much as in a majority white classroom. Both federal reports examined in this chapter are sometimes cited in support of the proposition.

A special analysis of data from the Racial Isolation study shows that average verbal achievement scores of white twelfth graders in predominantly Negro schools are lower than average scores in a predominantly white school.[1] Social class complicates the matter, however. As Pettigrew notes, the schools in question are not only predominantly black; they are also "predominantly lower-status."[2] There were too few upper status schools which were predominantly black for a statistical analysis.

An examination of the evidence suggests that those whites in predominantly Negro schools who scored low were virtually all from a low socioeconomic status. But how low? When the racial character of a neighborhood changes, the more affluent whites move first. As a rule, the whites who remain to the last are those too poor to find alternative housing. This might suggest that these poor whites are as poor as the Negroes. Armor has found, in a further re-analysis of the Office of Education data, that "the social class index of whites in predominantly black schools drops below that of blacks."[3] These whites, then, are extremely poor and thus highly unrepresentative of whites in general. Accordingly, it is unwarranted to draw conclusions for all white children that are based on such an atypical group.

---

[1] See Pettigrew, "Social Evaluation Theory," p. 292.

[2] Ibid.

[3] David J. Armor, School and Family Effects on Black and White Achievement: A Re-examination of the USOE Data (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Department of Social Relations, Harvard University, June, 1969), p. 62.

A more direct approach would be to test samples of white students who are now in predominantly black and white schools to discover whether it is Negro predominance or extremely low social class that accounts for low white achievement; or indeed, whether low achievement is the rule. On this page is a list of thirteen large city school districts in which at least ten percent of the white students attend mostly-black schools.[1] Apparently, no study of these schools has yet been made. The general approach of the Office of Education study holds that social class is far more important than race as a factor in academic achievement.

	Number of White students in predominantly Minority School	Percent of All White Students in School District
San Francisco, California	5,244	13.5
Oakland, California	4,233	21.3
District of Columbia	3,636	43.9
Louisville, Kentucky	3,197	10.8
New Orleans, Louisana	3,465	10.0
Baltimore, Maryland	8,576	12.8
Detroit, Michigan	16,768	14.6
Flint, Michigan	3,629	12.7
Jersey City, New Jersey	2,138	13.0
Newark, New Jersey	3,936	28.7
Cincinnati, Ohio	5,861	11.9
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	18,468	16.9
Richmond, Virginia	1,358	10.0
	70,509	

---

[1] Data are drawn from Table 1, pp. 8-10, above.

There is, however, a limit to how much light can be shed on this question by data from the Office of Education study. As has been pointed out, the study was cross-sectional, not longitudinal. Consequently, its findings are not applicable to problems of change over a period of time. Desegregation is just such a change. With the progress of the desegregation movement, black communities are demanding increasingly that some white students be assigned Negro schools rather than following the historic pattern of assigning Negroes to white schools. This trend may be expected to continue for it reflects, in large part, growing political power of Negroes and heightened black self-awareness. Thus, researchers will find ample opportunity for their studies.

CHAPTER 8

THE NEGRO COMMUNITY AND DESEGREGATION

The contemporary Negro movement for human rights is historic in that it is largely Negro and is led by Negroes. Yet, little is known about the Negro community background of the movement for equal educational opportunity. A large number of community studies have been made but these turn out to deal with white community attitudes toward Negroes. It is exceedingly difficult to grasp the present historic challenge in American education without gaining a perspective on changes within the Negro community. In the body of the present chapter, six topics are discussed: (1) the attitudes of Negro adults who attended desegregated schools; (2) studies of attitudes toward desegregation in various local Negro communities; (3) results of national public opinion polls that relate to Negro and white attitudes on desegregation; (4) local desegregation movements taking the form of demonstrative actions by organized Negroes; (5) certain aspects of Negro parent participation in school affairs; and (6) some structural features of the Negro ghetto community.

1. DESEGREGATED ADULTS AND DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

A. The NORC Study

During the summer of 1966, the National Opinion Research Center conducted a survey for the United States Commission on Civil Rights.[1] Interviewed were 1,624

---

[1] Robert L. Crain and others, The Effects of De Facto School Segregation: A Survey of Negro Adults in Northern Cities, unpublished study prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, November, 1966)

Negro men and women who lived in the North and West. The primary problem of the survey was to measure the long-run effects of school integration on adult Negroes; the respondents were between the ages of 21 and 45. The summary findings of the survey are as follows:[1]

> ... The impact of integration is widespread. Negro graduates of integrated schools are less likely to have attended and graduated college.... The present study found that /Negro students in integrated schools not only score higher on achievement tests while in school but that/ they continue to score higher as adults. They are more likely to have better jobs and higher incomes. In general, they have more contact with whites as adults, less anti-white feeling, and in general, stronger feelings of optimism about the opportunities available to them and a greater sense of happiness....

The survey found, too, that Negro adults who had attended integrated elementary school were, contrary to common expectation, not from higher socioeconomic circumstances than adults who had attended segregated schools. (Education and marital stability of parents was the measure of socioeconomic status of family.)

Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement: "Good luck is just as important as hard work for success." Table 1 illustrates the finding:[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p.4.

[2] Ibid., p. 45.

Table 1

Percent Disagreeing With Statement, By Integration of Elementary and High School, Northern-Born Students

	Elementary School	
High School	Integrated	Segregated
Integrated	50	26
Segregated	39	37

NORC found that "those who attended integrated schools in the North are much more likely to disagree with this item than those who attended segregated schools."[1]

NORC reported indirect evidence that Negroes who had attended integrated schools made more informal contacts with whites which led more frequently to a job.[2]

In general, Negroes who attended integrated schools as children are less antagonistic toward whites even if the Negroes now live in segregated housing. NORC comments: "Past contact with whites is a substitute for present contact in breaking down Negro desires to avoid whites. This implies that even if segregation in other aspects of American society is unchanged, an increase in school integration will in itself increase the willingness of Negroes to associate with whites."[3] On the other hand, less social distance does not mean greater illusions. Nearly nine tenths of the once-desegregated Negroes agreed that "the trouble with white people is that they think they are better than other people."[4]

Having attended an integrated school has a profound influence on the Negro adult. In ascertaining respondents' feeling of happiness:[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 44.

[2] Ibid., p. 64.

[3] Ibid., p. 79.

[4] Ibid., p. 82. In general, see Schwartz, Trends in White Attitudes Toward Negroes.

> ... We find that having a high education, having attended an integrated school, or having a high number of contacts with whites each increases happiness, and surprisingly, school integration is the most important of the three factors.

NORC suggest that school integration enhances the self-conception of the Negro and thus contributes to his happiness.[2]

NORC also interviewed a national sample of adult whites during the summer of 1966. In a few cases, it was possible to trace the effect upon these white adults of having attended integrated schools. Such adults had uniformly more favorable attitudes toward integration of the school in their present neighborhood, and expressed less anti-Negro prejudice.

Table 2

Percent Highly Prejudiced, Among White Persons Who Did and Did Not Attend School With Negroes, By Educational Status of Respondent and Spouse[3]

Educational Status of Respondent and Spouse	Percent Highly Prejudiced Attended School With Negroes	Attended All-White Schools
Very High	11	12
High	12	22
Medium	27	35
Low	15	25

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 89, 92.

[2] See tables in Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II, pp. 218-220.

[3] Ibid., p. 107.

Table 2 shows that even of the most highly prejudiced whites, those who had attended integrated schools were less likely to be prejudiced.

The NORC survey data on whites were analyzed in greater detail under supervision of Pettigrew.[1] In general, but more so for males than for females, adult whites who had attended desegregated schools reported that at least at one time they had had a close Negro friend, had had a Negro friend visit their home, and were living in a neighborhood that housed some Negroes now. White adults who had experienced interracial schooling tended to favor interracial neighborhoods. The effect of having had a Negro friend at one time is a powerful factor in determining a favorable attitude toward interracial neighborhoods. Among white respondents who had attended segregated schools, those who had had a Negro friend at one time were now more favorable to integrated neighborhoods than those who had never had a Negro friend.

Pettigrew drew three major conclusions from this analysis:[2]

> Prior desegregated schooling enhances the probability that white Americans will have and will continue to have contact with Negro Americans....
>
> To a lesser extent, prior desegregated schooling enhances the probability that white Americans will express more positive attitudes toward interracial contact and Negro rights....
>
> Childhood contact leads to later contact and to more favorable attitudes toward contact; it leads somewhat less to rejection of racially discriminatory practices,

---

[1] See Appendix C5. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II, pp. 221-241.

[2] Ibid., p. 224.

> and little if any to more positive acceptance of Negro protest.

He noted several reservations of a procedural nature about the data gathered. These related to the inability to control for several variables. In the main, however, Pettigrew held that difficulties did not vitiate the above conclusions.

B. The Oakland Study.

In the Oakland, California study, discussed in Chaper II, above, data were collected on the consequence of attendance in interracial schools. Three findings were noted:[1]

> 1. Negro graduates who attended desegregated schools are more willing for their offspring to have an interracial education than those who attended segregated schools.
>
> 2. Negro graduates who attended desegregated schools are more willing to live in biracial neighborhoods (irrespective of difficulty encountered) and are more likely to have white friends, than Negroes who attended segregated schools.
>
> 3. Negro graduates who attended desegregated schools are on the average less suspicious of whites, and feel somewhat more at ease in a biracial setting, than similar Negroes who attended segregated schools.

These findings were highly consistent with those of the NORC study.

---

[1] Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II, p. 208.

2. NEGRO COMMUNITY ATTITUDES

Blumenfeld studied the Negro social elite in Baltimore.[1] Until 1901, most elementary school teachers and all high school teachers were white. By 1910 or so, Negro teachers had replaced white teachers in the legally segregated Negro elementary schools. Nearly all the former were graduates ot a one year course in the and Training School in Baltimore. This teacher group developed into a segregated Negro elite. By the early 1960's, the group was no longer united on the principle of ethnic separation. As Blumenfeld notes:[2]

> In 1962, while some of the Elite families were sending their children to schools which were an hour's drive away in order that the children might attend an integrated school, a sizable number of Elite families would have their children travel a comparable distance in order to avoid having the child sit in an integrated classroom.

No support is found in Blumenfeld's study for the often heard generalization that desegregation has a distinctive appeal to the Negro middle class.

Rivera, McWorter, and Lillienstein studied, among other things, social class factors in two large-scale school boycotts in Chicago.[3] In tracing those Negro parents who had supported the first boycott in October, 1963, but "defected" from the second in February, 1964, Rivera and associates explained:[1]

---

[1] Ruth Blumenfeld, Children of Integration, (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66=251).

[2] Ibid., p. 112.

[3] Ramon J. Rivera, Gerald A. McWorter, and Ernest Lillienstein, "Freedom Day II in Chicago," Integrated Education, August-September, 1964

> Those who shifted from a pro to an anti-boycott stand... were disproportionately persons of higher educational attainment. These figures imply a challenge to at least one widely held assumption concerning the values of middle-class Negroes: that such persons attach overriding importance to the principle of desegregated public school facilities.... /Defectors/ tend to stress the quality of their children's education over the number of whites who happen to be enrolled in neighborhood schools.

The October boycott had drawn 224,000 Negro students while the February boycott drew 172,000.[2] The largest differences in participation were found in middle-class Negro areas.

In May, 1963, and again late in 1964, De Berry and Agger conducted public opinion studies of the small Negro community in Portland, Oregon.[3] About nine of every ten Negro respondents approved of integrated neighborhoods and schools. Almost three quarters of the group approved of busing children for purposes of racial balance. These views did not change during the year and a half intervening between the two studies.

During October, 1964, Marx surveyed a national sample of Negro Americans.[4] He found that "the black nationalist sympathizers in our sample are at least as high and even higher than others in their concern over integration and in their opposition to discrimination."[1] In response to the question, "Do you think white children and Negro children should go to the same schools or to separate schools?" the following percentages of the national sample selected the "same schools" answer.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 37,40.

[2] Integrated Education, April-May, 1964, p.7.

[3] Clyde De Berry and Robert E. Agger, "School and Race in Portland," Integrated Education, April-May, 1965.

[4] Gary T. Marx, Protest and Prejudice. A Study of Belief in the Black Community (New York: Harper & Row, 1967)

96%	New York
93%	Chicago
84%	Atlanta
79%	Birmingham

The more militant the viewpoint on Negro rights, the stronger the support for school desegregation.[3]

During Spring and Summer, 1965, Smith and associates polled a Negro sample in Metropolitan Detroit.[4] When asked "would you say the racial integration of schools is moving /at a certain pace/?" responses were grouped as in the table which follows.

Table 3

Negro Views on Pace of School Desegregation in Detroit Area[5]

	Non-Members of any formal association	Holders of a single membership	Holders of a plural membership
Too Rapidly	9%	6%	2%

---

[1] Ibid., p. 110.

[2] Ibid., p. 21.

[3] Ibid., p. 46.

[4] Ralph V. Smith, Stanley E. Flory, Rashid L. Bashsur, and Gary W. Shannon, Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area: An Ecological Analysis (Ypsilanti, Michigan: Eastern Michigan University, September 8, 1967).

[5] Ibid., p. 39.

About right	37%	41%	33%
Too slowly	45%	44%	65%
Don't know	9%	9%	0%

In the NORC survey, it was found that whether or not the Negro respondent had attended a desegregated school strongly influenced his response to the following question: "Is it a hardship on a Negro child to go to an integrated school if he is one of a small number of Negroes in the school?" Here is a compilation of the responses:[1]

	Northern-born; school was		Southern born; school was		Southern educated
	Integ.	Segreg.	Integ.	Segreg.	Segregated
Percent saying yes, it is a hardship	33	43	30	48	50

In the Dumbarton study of Oakland Negro high school graduates in the sample felt that "the Negro child would be better off in a school with white children (ninety-four percent) and the majority (sixty-four percent) regard integration no hardship on the Negro child even if he is but one of a few in the school."[2] Eighty-one percent of the graduates who had attended desegregated schools were willing for their own child to be sent out of the neighborhood; only fifty-five percent of those who had attended segregated schools were willing.[1]

---

[1] Robert L. Crain and others, The Effects of De Facto School Segregation: A Survey of Negro Adults in Northern Cities, unpublished study prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1966), p. 76.

[2] Dumbarton Research Council, Race and Education in the City of Oakland, draft, unpublished study prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (Menlo Park, California: Dumbarton Research Council, October, 1966), p. 135.

Pettigrew reported that desegregation tended to become self-perpetuating. Once having attended a desegregated school, both Negroes and whites were all the more willing to send their own children to such schools; and they were more willing to advocate desegregation as a principle. It is important to note that this finding held even with respondents who presently lived in segregated housing.

Krystall, Chesler, and White made a study in February, June, and November of 1966 of the Negro community in Montgomery, Alabama.[2] One-hundred twenty-seven parents were interviewed; they had 252 children in school. Only four of these children (1.6 percent) were enrolled in desegregated public schools.[3] Only a third of the parents believed Negro schools were at least as good as white schools; over half (55 percent) believed Negro schools were inferior. Yet, nearly all the parents (96 percent) expressed satisfaction with their children's schooling. The researchers had no ready explanation for this seeming contradiction.

In March, 1966, a federal court directed the Montgomery school board to install a free-choice enrollment system. Very few Negro parents applied. While many indicated at one time or another their intention to register their children, it was found that 80% really have not considered seriously the possibility of sending their children to an all-white school."[4] At the same time, nearly as many (71 percent) approved of the principle of desegregated schools. Table 4 reveals some of the reasoning behind the hesitancy of Negro parents.[5]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 140.

[2] Eric R. Krystall, Mark A. Chesler, and Agatha E. White, *Voting Behavior and Attitudes Toward School Desegregation: A Study of Southern Negroes* (Tuskegee, Alabama: Department of Social Science Research, Tuskegee Institute, March, 1967).

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

Table 4

Advantages and Disadvantages of Going to a White School, According to Negro Parents in Montgomery, Alabama

	Advantages		Disadvantages
Children learn more	23%	Adjust to new school	15%
Wider subject choice	6	No white friends	18
Better facilities and equipment	28	Harm from whites	22
More attention from teachers	5	Transportation	8
White schools better; equal education	8	Don't know	37
Don't know	30		

The increasing salience of black nationalist ideology may also help explain the hesitancy to desegregate, although the researchers do not offer this explanation. Late in 1964, Marx polled a national sample of Negroes with this question: "If the United States got into a war today, would you personally feel this country was worth fighting for, or not?" Ninety-one percent of Marx's Birmingham sample said yes.[1] Almost two years later, in the study by Krystall and associates, Montgomery adult Negroes were asked to agree or disagree with this statement:

"Negroes who are denied first class citizenship here in the U.S. should not go and fight for the U.S. in some foreign country." Grouping the replies of registered voters[2] by whether they registered before or after passage of the 1965 federal Voting Right Act, here is how they responded:[3]

---

[1] Marx, Protest and Prejudice, p. 30.

[2] Eighty-one percent of the sample was registered.

[3] Krystall, Chesler, and White, p. 9.

	Registered Before 1965	Registered After 1965
Agree	48%	52%
Disagree	62	38

Assuming a degree of likeness between the Negro people in Birmingham and Montgomery, the later study shows a sharp rise in black nationalist sentiment.

During the first half of 1967, Passow directed a comprehensive survey of the District of Columbia public school system.[1] Over 90 percent of the system's enrollment consists of Negro children. Nevertheless, fifty-eight percent of Negro parents favored to desegregate the schools and only twenty-six percent favored upgrading the segregated schools; corresponding percentages for white parents were 26 and 48.[2] Here is a summary of survey results on three questions asked of Negro and white parents:[3]

Table 5

The Use of Busing and Creation of Metropolitan School District to Enhance District Integration (in Percentage)

	Total	Negro	White
Position on integration			
Integrated schools	49	58	26
Improve segregated schools	33	27	48
Not sure	18	15	26

---

[1] A. Harry Passow, Toward Creating a Model Urban School System: A Study of the Washington, D.C. Public Schools (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967).

[2] Ibid., p. 77.

[3] Ibid., p. 71.

Busing			
Favor	38	45	21
Oppose	50	41	69
Not sure	12	14	10
Metropolitan school district			
Favor	29	34	19
Oppose	54	49	67
Not sure	17	17	14

Community leaders, according to Passow, do not share the Negro parents' dedication to integration: "Most leaders interviewed seem to have abandoned their hope of integrating the public schools in Washington, D.C."[1]

Spiegel led a study of civic violence in six large cities: Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Dayton, Akron, San Francisco, and Boston.[2] He found a great impatience among Negroes at the slow progress of desegregation.

A study of civil rights in Chicago was made during the summer of 1967.[3] Ninety-three percent of Negro respondents favored integrated schools. Negro and white respondents were asked: "How about you? Are you less in favor of rapid integration or more strongly in favor of rapid integration than you were a year ago?" Responses were as follows:[4]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 77.

[2] John P. Spiegel in U.S. Congress, 90th, 1st session, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, *Antiriot Bill--1967 Hearings*, Part 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967). See, also, Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, *Six-City Study. A Survey of Racial Attitudes in Six Northern Cities: Preliminary Findings* (Waltham, Massachusetts: Brandeis University, June, 1967)

[3] The Interuniversity Social Research Committee--Chicago Metropolitan Area, *Militancy for and against Civil Rights and Integration in Chicago: Summer, 1967* (Chicago: Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago, August 1, 1967).

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

	Negro	White
Less in favor	9.4	50.1
About the same	32.6	34.9
More in favor	57.9	15.0

The researchers reported: "Our data suggest that ... it is not only adequate schools but integrated schools ... to which Negroes aspire.... There is absolutely no indication in these data that a northern version of 'separate but equal' facilities and housing will be accepted by the growing Negro middle-class."[1]

The Chicago researchers constructed a civil rights index and a militance of action index; the former is a measure of opinion on a range of public issues; the latter, on orientation toward social action. Table 13 classifies the responses given to a question about schools in Chicago. Fewer than half the Negro respondents think the schools are good; the more dissatisfied they are with schools, the more devoted on civil rights issues and the more militant in tactics. A number of significant interrelations can be found among the responses within each racial group as well as between the groups.

Perhaps most significant is the fact that summer, 1967, was--for Chicago--very mild civil rights weather. There were virtually no public demonstrations or marches and the public school system had receded temporarily from public view as an issue of contention. Civil rights organizations were experiencing large losses in support. Yet, Negro dedication to school integration grew. Hardly less significant was the further fact that Negro devotion to integration did not suffer in the face of black nationalist endeavors.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 71.

Table 6

CIVIL RIGHTS INDEX

	Percent distribution	Full acceptance	Open occupancy	School Integration	Equal employment & facilities	Total number
How would you rate the public schools in this neighborhood?						
White						
Good	65.4	35.9	41.5	12.8	9.8	686
Fair	10.4	42.9	30.4	11.6	15.2	112
Poor	3.8	39.0	31.7	14.6	14.6	41
Don't know	20.4	36.0	38.3	15.9	9.8	214
Negro						
Good	40.8	71.1	23.6	3.9	1.4	280
Fair	24.6	72.8	23.7	2.9	0.6	173
Poor	12.2	86.7	10.8	2.4	0.0	83
Don't know	22.4	63.9	29.7	3.2	3.2	155

MILITANCE-OF-ACTION INDEX

	Pro-Action		Neutral	Anti-Action		Total Number
	Strong	Moderate		Strong	Moderate	
White						
Good	1.1	25.7	7.6	36.6	29.0	708
Fair	5.3	22.1	8.0	37.2	27.4	113
Poor	2.4	34.1	4.9	36.6	22.0	41
Don't know	2.3	20.8	10.4	40.7	25.8	221
Negro						
Good	20.2	76.0	2.8	1.0	0.0	287
Fair	31.2	63.6	1.2	3.5	0.6	173
Poor	39.5	57.0	2.3	1.2	0.0	86
Don't know	19.6	74.1	2.5	3.8	0.0	158

Between April and October, 1966, Negro and white adults in four Connecticut cities were interviewed on a broad range of urban problems. Questions relating to housing integration elicited an overwhelmingly affirmative opinion from the Negro respondents.[1] On school desegregation matters, Negroes were far readier than whites to accept measures such as busing and cross-busing. Table 7 reports some of these results.

During the summer of 1967, residents of the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Central Brooklyn, New York, received special training and conducted a public opinion survey of their area; the project was supervised by the Center for Urban Education. Attitudes toward segregation-integration were probed. Respondents were asked if they thought it possible for a child to get a good education in a school attended only by Negro and Puerto Rican children. Answers were as follows, by percentages:[2]

	Number	Yes, possible	No, not possible	Don't know
Negro	2,528	40	41	19
White	137	46	28	26
Puerto Ricans	228	54	24	22

When asked to indicate whether they considered integration of schools and housing important or not important, seventy-nine percent and eighty-two percent respectively, thought these were important.[1] On the other hand, both matters were ranked rather low as community priorities, quite far behind economic opportunities, better housing, and new schools.

---

[1] Irving L. Allen and J. David Colfax, Urban Problems and Public Opinion in Four Connecticut Cities (Sotrrs, Connecticut: Institute of Urban Research, University of Connecticut, December, 1968), p. 53.

[2] Residents of Bedford-Stuyvesant, Community Attitudes in Bedford-Stuyvesant: An Area Study. Summer 1967 (New York: Center for Urban Education, July, 1968), p. 72.

Table 7

Negro and White Opinion
on Proposal to Bus Negro Children to Schools in White
Neighborhood, Four Connecticut Cities, 1966 by Percent[2]

	Bridgeport		Hartford		New Haven		Waterbury	
	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agree	19.0	30.7	24.3	59.3	19.1	45.5	17.5	29.6
Disagree	69.2	24.0	62.4	24.4	67.1	36.4	70.4	56.3
Mix, both agree and disagree	5.0	40.0	5.9	9.8	6.4	14.0	5.5	5.9
Don't know	6.8	5.3	7.5	6.5	7.5	4.0	6.5	8.1
N	516	75	510	123	425	99	382	135

Negro and White Opinion
on Proposal to Bus White Children to Schools In Negro
Neighborhoods, Four Connecticut Cities, 1966, By Percent

Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agree	14.7	33.3	14.7	55.3	13.9	43.4	22.8	45.2
Disagree	76.4	25.3	74.5	27.6	76.5	40.4	62.8	44.4

---

[1] Ibid., p. 25.

[2] Data from tables 1.8.13 and 1.8.14, in Irving L. Allen and J. David Colfax, Urban Problems and Public Opinion in Four Connecticut Cities (Storrs, Connecticut: Institute of Urban Research, University of Connecticut, December, 1968), pp. 155-156.

Mix, both agree and disagree	3.1	38.7	4.3	9.8	5.2	12.1	6.3	6.7
Don't know	5.8	2.7	6.5	7.3	4.5	4.0	8.1	3.7
N	516	75	510	123	425	999	382	135

3. NATIONAL PUBLIC OPINION POLLS

Brink and Harris reported on two comprehensive national studies of the Negro American, sponsored by Newsweek magazine.[1]

Seven out of ten Negroes favored integrated schools (in both years); another two were undecided. When asked whether the Negro child attending school with whites would do better or worse work, replies were as follows:[2]

	Total non-south	Total South
Better work	70%	62%
Worse work	1	4
About same	20	18
Not sure	9	16

About half favored busing their children to another part of town for integration.[3] In 1966, respondents were asked: "As far as your 'being able to get your children educated with white children,' do you feel you are better off today than you were three years ago, worse off, or about the same as you were then?" Replies were as follows:[4]

---

1. William Brink and Louis Harris, The Negro Revolution in America (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1964) and Black and White (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967).

2. Brink and Harris, Negro Revolution in America, p. 237.

3. Ibid., p. 236.

4. Brink and Harris, Black and White, p. 228.

	Total all-interviews		Total Non-South	
	1966	1963	1966	1963
Better off	58%	39%	47%	28%
Worse off	3	5	3	6
About the same	23	35	34	45
Not sure	16	21	16	21

Between 1963 and 1966, therefore, Negro parents maintained their interest in school desegregation; they felt real progress had occurred, with southern Negroes reporting even more progress; and there was a pragmatic reason for supporting desegregation--parents thought their children would learn more while attending a desegregated school.

From 1963 through 1967, numerous national public opinion polls were taken; specific questions on desegregation were often included. Following is a sampling.

In 1965, a Harris poll reported that Negro parents were less favorable to busing than two years earlier.[1] In 1966, the Gallup Poll found that whites were happier than Negroes, yet the number of Negro parents expressing satisfaction with the education their children were receiving rose from 43 percent to 64 percent since 1963.[2] A Gallup Poll of August, 1967, asked: "In your opinion, how well do you think Negroes are treated in this community?" Responses were as follows:[3]

	Negroes	Whites
The same as whites	44%	76%
Not very well	44	15
Badly	9	1
No opinion	3	8

---

1. Integrated Education, April-May, 1965, p.4.
2. Ibid., February-March, 1967, p.4.
3. Ibid., October-November, 1967, p.4.

During October-November, 1967, a Fortune poll found that urban Negro Americans strongly supported desegregation.[1]

Over 300 Negroes in thirteen cities responded to Negro interviewers as follows when asked to rank their own objectives:

More education for my children	97%
More desegregation	93
A better job	87
Some kind of special training	77
Better police protection	69
More education for myself	62
Making neighborhood a better place to live	60
More money to spend	53
Moving out of the neighborhood	20

When asked whether they accept integration as a goal for Negroes, they responded as follows:

		Age of respondent	
	Total	16-25 Years	26 Years and over
No--integration of any kind not desirable	5%	9	2
Yes--limited integration wanted, in terms of equal opportunity in jobs, education, and housing	77%	72	81
Yes--total integration wanted on all levels	12%	12	11

---

[1] Roger Beardwood, "The New Negro Mood," Fortune, January, 1968.

4. COMPARATIVE PUBLIC OPINION

In 1969, the Gallup Poll asked a national sample of white and Negro adults what they thought of the pace of racial integration in the schools. The replies were as follows, in percentages:[1]

	Too fast	Not fast enough	About right	No Opinion
NATIONAL	44	22	25	9
College	30	40	25	5
High school	47	19	25	9
Grade school	49	15	23	13
Whites	46	20	25	9
Negroes	20	45	27	8
Northern whites	46	20	25	9
Southern whites	58	10	25	7

When asked, "Would you, yourself, have any objection to sending your children to a school where a few of the children are Negroes?" a national sample of white adults responded, in percentages:

Northern White Parents

	Yes, would object	No, would not	No Opinion
1963	10	87	3
1965	7	91	2
1966	6	93	1
1969	7	93	-

---

1. See Integrated Education, 7 (1969) 51-52.

Southern White Parents

	Yes, would object	No, would not	No opinion
1963	61	38	1
1965	37	62	1
1966	24	74	2
1969	21	78	1

"When half of the children are Negroes?"

Northern White Parents

	Yes, would object	No, would not	No Opinion
1963	33	56	11
1965	28	65	7
1966	32	64	4
1969	28	69	3

Southern White Parents

	Yes, would object	No, would not	No Opinion
1963	78	17	5
1965	68	27	5
1966	49	44	7
1969	46	47	7

"Where more than half of the children are Negroes?"

Northern White Parents

	Yes, would object	No, would not	No Opinion
1963	53	31	16

1965	52	37	11
1966	60	32	8
1969	54	39	7

Southern White Parents

	Yes, would object	No, would not	No opinion
1963	86	6	8
1965	78	16	6
1966	62	27	11
1969	64	26	10

The gap in viewpoint between southern and northern adults narrowed dramatically in the years 1963-1969, and in each case favorably to integration. Geographical differences are now only slightly more significant than educational differences when it comes to attitudes toward school integration.

In September, 1968, a national sample of white respondents was asked by the Harris Poll whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement: "Negroes have less native intelligence than whites." The replies:[1]

	Percent agree	Percent disagree
Total whites	44	56
By education:		
8th grade or less	60	40
High school	53	47
College	30	70

---

[1] See Integrated Education, 6 (1968) 4.

By age:		
Under 35	28	72
35-49	44	56
50 and over	53	47

Comparing responses by whites in two general polls of 1963 and 1968, the Harris Poll reported that "there has been only minor change in the attitudes of white people in this country toward Negroes.... The softening in white attitude toward blacks has been minimal at best."[1]

During the week of February 5-12, 1970, the Harris Survey asked persons in a national sample whether they approved or disapproved of the October 29, 1969 U.S. Supreme Court decision that schools must be "integrated now." The total sample responded as follows, in percent:[2]

Approve	48
Disapprove	40
Not sure	12
	100

Geographically and otherwise, the distribution, by percent, was as follows:

	Approve	Disapprove	Not sure
South	33	55	12
East	58	30	12
West	54	34	12
Midwest	51	38	11
Rural residents	35	50	15
Residents of big cities	59	32	9
Suburban residents	51	37	12

---

1. Ibid.
2. Chicago Tribune, March 16, 1970.

6

Republicans	43	45	12
Democrats	50	37	13

The greatest number of critics of the court's decision were found among whites in the Deep South and border states and persons who had voted for George Wallace for president in 1968.

Persons in the national sample were asked to express a viewpoint on the general strategy of desegregation. They responded as follows:[1]

	Approve	Dis-approve	Not sure
Integration of schools has been the law since 1954 and it is about time to enforce the law	58	28	14
It is morally wrong to force desegration on people who don't want it	49	37	14

Responses to this pair of questions suggest: (a) decisive commitment to enforcement of the Supreme Court decision, and simultaneously, (2) a tendency to regret the need to compel acceptance of the enforcement.

During February 27-March 2, 1970 The Gallup Poll repeated its 1969 question to a national sample of adults: "Do you think the racial integration of schools in the United States is going too fast or not fast enough?" Responses were as follows:[2]

	1970	1969
Too fast	48	44
Not fast enough	17	22
About right	21	25
No opinion	14	9

---

1. Chicago Tribune, March 19, 1970.
2. New York Times, March 12, 1970, p. 20.

On a geographical basis the responses were distributed as follows:

Northern Whites

Too fast	46	42
Not fast enough	16	24
About right	23	24
No opinion	16	10

Southern Whites

Too fast	69	58
Not fast enough	6	10
About right	13	25
No opinion	12	7

Three-quarters of adult Negroes responded that the pace of school integration was "not fast enough."

It may be important to note that the two preceding 1970 polls were taken at a time when school desegregation was the most hotly debated national issue.

The Texas Poll reported in 1969 that a majority of whites in the state had come to favor school integration. When asked whether they would favor sending their children to the same schools with Negroes, the following percentages replied affirmatively:[1]

1963	41
1964	52
1966	53
1968	69
1969	65

When asked whether they would favor their children having a a Negro roommate at college, the following percentages respond affirmatively:

---

[1] See Integrated Education, 7 (1969) 67.

1963	8
1964	14
1966	18
1968	21
1969	24

The growing favorable attitude toward school integration suggests that while the letter of segregationist criticism is directed at northern and federal governmental pressures, the furious spirit of the attack might well be aimed at those "back home" who increasingly reject the segregationist doctrine.

5. ORGANIZED LOCAL DESEGREGATION MOVEMENTS

The surest sign of community support for desegregation is a public demonstration on its behalf. Many more of these occur, North and South, than are recorded in the national newspapers and magazines; sometimes they go unrecorded, even in the major local newspaper. News of local community desegregation developments throughout the country is published regularly in the bi-monthly Integrated Education: RACE AND SCHOOLS.[1] The general inattention to these community demonstrations has made it more difficult to gauge accurately the role of desegregation in Negro communities.

Following is an incomplete compilation of these events drawn from Integrated Education, 1965-1969:

Place	Form of Action
New York, New York	School boycott
Teaneck, New Jersey	School board elections

---

[1] Published by Integrated Education Associates, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604

Trenton, New Jersey	Demonstration on behalf of Chester movement for integration
Evanston, Illinois	NAACP threat to help defect bond issue
Houston, Texas	School boycott
Tipton County, Tennessee	Demonstration
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Picket line
Springfield, Massachusetts	Sit-in, school board office
Boston, Massachusetts	Sit-in at school
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Picketing of school
Chicago, Illinois	School boycott
St. Paul, Minnesota	Picketing of school board
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	Picketing of school board
Crawfordville, Georgia	Demonstration
Washington, Georgia	Demonstration
Bogalusa, Louisiana	School boycott
Huntsville, Texas	Demonstration
Natchez, Mississippi	Boycott of stores
Lincolnton, Georgia	School boycott
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	School boycott
Riverside, California	School boycott
Bridgeport, Connecticut	Demonstration
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Picketing of construction site
Tuscaloosa, Alabama	School boycott
Atlantic City, New Jersey	Picketing of school board
Englewood, New Jersey	Unauthorized group registration at white school
Laverne, Alabama	School boycott
Natchez, Mississippi	City-Wide school boycott
Lorman, Mississippi	Demonstration by students
Cordele, Georgia	Demonstration by students
Jacksonville, Florida	Picketing of school board
Seattle, Washington	School boycott

Detroit, Michigan	School boycott
Englewood, New Jersey	Parent demonstrations
Phoenix-South Holland, Illinois	School boycott
Grenada, Mississippi	Demonstration
Woodville, Mississippi	Demonstration
Peoria, Illinois	Sit-in at school board office
Providence, Rhode Island	Demonstration
Fayette, Mississippi	Boycott of stores
Jacksonville, Florida	School boycott
Oakland, California	School boycott
Grenada, Mississippi	School boycott
Port Gibson, Mississippi	Boycott of stores
Menlo Park, California	Picketing of school
Maywood, Illinois	Demonstration
District of Columbia	Boycott of schools
Toledo, Ohio	Boycott of school
Lexington, Kentucky	Demonstration
Wadesboro, North Carolina	Boycott of school
Benton Harbor, Michigan	NAACP helps defeat bond issue?
Gary, Indiana	School boycott
Buffalo, New York	Demonstration
Hillsborough, North Carolina	Boycott
Waycross, Georgia	Boycott
Darby, Pennsylvania	Picketing of school
Niagara Falls, New York	Boycott
Darby, Pennsylvania	Picketing of school
Niagara Falls, New York	Boycott
Swan Quarter, North Carolina	Boycott
Sylvester, Georgia	Demonstration
West Palm Beach, Florida	Demonstration
Charlotte, North Carolina	Demonstration
Austin, Texas	Demonstration
Fulton County, Georgia	Boycott
Memphis, Tennessee	Boycotts and demonstrations
Gainesville, Florida	Boycott
Rochester, New York	Boycott and demonstrations

Undoubtedly, many other cases went unrecorded. Also, numerous non-demonstrative public actions on behalf of desegregation were taken. Among these were public meetings, filing of lawsuits, gatherings to support Negro children already enrolled in desegregated schools, public appeals to the Negro community to use the opportunity to enroll in such schools, sermons preached and countless other actions, including electoral work. Many of the actions have been followed by a long train of negotiations which also keep the issue alive in many Negro communities.

6. PARENTAL PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL AFFAIRS

Gordon has remarked:[1]

> The tradition in school administration of discouraging lay people, particularly poor or minority lay people, from participating in the determination of school policy will need to be sharply modified. These parents and community spokesmen may be a hidden resource which the depressed area schools have used inappropriately or not at all.

It might be said that a fairly widespread reconsideration of the Negro parents' role in the school is under way. Part of it arises from political exigencies; organized parent groups are demanding an increased voice. A smaller part is due to growing knowledge and awareness of the actual parental role. In the process of this new consciousness, a number of traditional preconceptions are being revised.

Some years ago a school administrator stated what was and still is a common understanding: "It is the better communities, which get the better school facilities and they get them because they are more articulate."[1] Inferentially, then, the less "better" communities were inarticulate; often, they were also assumed to be apathetic about the schools. In certain respects, this view was realistic; in largest measure, however, it was an oversimplified conception. At any rate, one could be fairly sure that the preconceptions were seldom tested against the reality of the Negro community. It was not a congenial subject for Caucasian researchers, nor, apparently, for Negro middle-class researchers.

---

[1] Edmund W. Gordon, "Equalizing Educational Opportunity in the Public School," IRCD Bulletin, November, 1967, p.3.

More recently, scholarly excursions into the ghetto have increased. Consequently, we are getting a more adequate basis for understanding the relation of the Negro community to the school.

More than a dozen years ago, Riessman found that the Negro worker in Philadelphia was not only more willing than the white worker to participate in school affairs: "... The proportion of Negro workers indicating a positive willingness to participate in community and school activity is approximately the same for the white middle-class group."[2] In the Detroit metropolitan area, when support is defined in terms of willingness to pay taxes. "Negro blue collar workers are more supportive of education than are whites who are professional, technical, or kindred."[3] In Washington, D.C., Negro parents attended PTA meetings somewhat more frequently than white parents.[1] Among Negro parents in the extremely large-scale Pruitt-Igoe public housing project in St. Louis, a researcher reported that "a significant number of parents (eighty-four percent) revealed a positive attitude toward education; however, only (forty-three percent) expressed a positive attitude toward teachers."[2] In a Chicago ghetto school, sixty-three percent of whose students live in public housing, teachers rated nearly seventy percent of the parents as cooperative.[3] The great number of public demonstrative actions on behalf of desegregation, discussed earlier, also indicate a positive orientation toward schools. De Berry and Agger reported that in Portland, Oregon "Negroes--much more than whites--would like to have more influence in school affairs than they feel they have currently."[4]

---

[1] Thaddeus J. Lubera, Assistant Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools, March 7, 1951, quoted in Helen E. Amerman, The Impact of Inter-Group Relations on Non-Segregated Urban Public Education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954), p. 139.

[2] Frank Riessman, Workers' Attitudes Toward Participation and Leadership (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1955), p. 137 (emphasis in original). (University Microfilms Order No. 13,999).

[3] Smith and others, Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area, p. 59.

Nevertheless, a completely new day has not yet dawned. Wayson studied teaching conditions in Chicago Negro ghetto schools. Experienced teachers who remained in these schools regarded as one attractive feature of the job "insularity from parental and other community pressures."[5] Wayson adds: "The slum school is isolated from the community and from parents who would question teachers' actions."[6]

---

1. Passow, Toward Creating a Model Urban School System, p. 69.

2. William Moore, Jr., A Portrait: The Culturally Disadvantaged Pre-School Child (Doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1964), pp. 178-179. (University Microfilms Order No. 64-13, 475).

3. Raymond L. Jerrems, A Sociological-Educational Study of a Public School in a Negro Lower-Class Area of a Big City (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965), p. 85.

4. De Berry and Agger, "School and Race in Portland," p. 14.

5. William W. Wayson, Expressed Motives of Teachers in Slum Schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1966), pp. 170-171.

6. Ibid., p. 177.

Gross and associates apparently had no great difficulty finding lower socioeconomic status (SES) schools in which parents took little interest in their children's education. They were able to make this generalization among others: For low SES schools, the greater the average parental interest in the academic performance of their children, the higher the academic productivity of the school.[1]

Hollister studied parent-school relations in eighteen Detroit elementary schools.[2] Four of the schools were low-income Negro schools; six were middle-class white students; and eight were integrated schools. He found:[3]

> ... Both low income Negro parents and middle-income white parents have greater interest in education, higher educational aspirations for their children, values and standards that are more congruent with those of the school, and greater knowledge of how to help their child get through school than low-income white parents /in the integrated schools/....

Lower-income white parents were less likely than either middle-income or Negro parents to initiate contact with the school. Hollister noted the contradiction between this finding and "much of the current practice literature that assumes uniformly indifferent attitudes toward the school among low-income populations.[4]

---

1. Neal Gross, Walter O. Jewell, III, Ralph G. Lewis, and Eigil D. Pederson, "Some Sociological Correlates of the 'Academic Productivity' of Urban Elementary Schools with Pupils from Families of Low Socio-Economic Status," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August, 1966, p. 18.

2. Clifton D. Hollister, Bureaucratic Structure and School-Parent Communication in Eighteen Detroit Elementary Schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-8277).

3. Ibid., p. 60.

4. Ibid., p. 151.

7. THE GHETTO COMMUNITY

Coleman speaks of "the low level of cohesion that characterizes Negro communities" being far lower than the general level in American cities.[1] At the same time, Coleman continues, there is lack of mutual trust, "a belief in my mind that if I aid you today, you will aid me when I am in need."[2] It is possible to gain a different impression from some research studies.

In his study of Roxbury, a Negro ghetto in Boston, Feagin held that social isolation did not characterize the residents.[3] "The overwhelming majority of these Negroes," according to Feagin, "feel that they have a duty to aid their neighbors."[4] He estimated that they were "probably as well integrated with their neighbors as whites in various socioeconomic areas of our urban complexes."[5] In his study of a public housing project in St. Louis, Moore observed: "The disadvantaged family is an oasis in the environment of urban indifference.... The attitude of the disadvantaged family is one of helping each other."[6] Choldin studied the help which migrants to Chicago had received during their first year there; he included six ethnic groups.[7] Two thirds of all migrants met a waiting friend or relative;

---

[1] James S. Coleman, *Race Relations and Social Change* (Baltimore, Maryland, Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, July, 1967), p. 9.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

[3] Joe Richard Feagin, *The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment: Structure and Variation* (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, March, 1966, p. 23.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 60.

[6] Moore, *A Portrait*, pp. 105-106.

[7] Harvey M. Choldin, *First Year in the Metropolis: A Study of Migration and Adjustment* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965.

Negroes--more precisely, non-whites--met someone with more than average frequency.[1] Non-whites," according to Choldin, "are more likely to receive help from the person who receives them."[2] He also found that white and non-white migrants were remarkably similar "in making social connections and adjusting to the neighborhoods...."[3]

A distinguishing mark of the ghetto is its concentration of people and social contacts within small compass. Smith and associates trace the growing residential segregation in the Detroit metropolitan area as well as the widening of what they term the "interaction gap," i.e., the range of Negro-white contacts.[4] By plotting an "interractional ellipse" around a center line of interaction, the researchers found that "the area of the mean ellipse for whites is forty-eight square miles."[5] In Roxbury, Feagin found of his sample that "approximately ninety-five percent of their friends and ninety-seven percent of their relatives live within the Roxbury-Dorchester area."[6] When Roxbury people moved--which was often--the mean distance was only 1.01 miles from their "old" neighborhood.[7] At the Pruitt-Igoe public housing project in St. Louis, Moore discovered that sixty-three percent of the 200 pre-schoolers he observed had never left the project, an area of 25 square blocks;[8] more poignantly, he reported: "Eighty-three percent of the pre-school children studied had never been to the city zoo."[9]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 50-51

[2] Ibid., p. 56.

[3] Ibid., p. 79.

[4] Smith and associates, Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area, pp. 23 and 41.

[5] Ibid., p. 14.

[6] Feagin, The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment, p. 204.

[7] Ibid., p. 171.

[8] Moore, A Portrait, p. 64.

[9] Ibid., p. 117.

The quality of human contact in the ghetto is not defined by the geographical constriction. Feagin warns that the ghetto does not mean "isolation, impersonality, or disorganization. Intimate ties are maintained even within the ethnic slum."[1] A high degree of friendship relationships characterized the 120 Roxbury wives who were interviewed by Feagin. Much visiting occurs with relatives and friends. This, however, is more than twice as frequent among middle-income respondents as low-income respondents.[2]

The ghetto is not only compressed; its people are, in Feagin's word, encapsulated. Moore reported that not a single family in the public housing project subscribed to a newspaper; in Roxbury many families were subscribers. In the 1963 Newsweek poll, only thirty-seven percent of low-income Negro families outside the South reported having a telephone; this was considerably lower than even non-urban southern Negroes.[3] Twenty-five percent of the former group of homes were without a television set: only fifteen percent of the latter lacked a set.

The Negro ghetto may be the only ethnic concentration in the United States in which the younger generation is not uniformly better schooled than its parents. In New York, during 1963-1964: "... For perhaps one Negro man in three, his education is no greater than that of his father. About ten percent have had less education than their fathers."[4]

---

[1] Feagin, The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment, p. 76.

[2] Ibid., p. 147.

[3] Brink and Harris, The Negro Revolution in America, p. 197.

[4] Jack Elinson, Paul W. Haberman, and Cyrille Gell, Ethnic and Educational Data on Adults in New York City, 1963-1964 (New York: School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine, Columbia University, 1967), p. iv. In the nation as a whole, Negroes follow the general pattern of improving education by generation; see John K. Folger and Charles B. Nam, Education of the American Population (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 150-151.

Even those youths who remain in the ghetto school fare poorly. In Central Harlem, "at least 50 percent of those in elementary schools are sufficiently retarded in the basic academic skills to require intensive remedial work, and at least 80 percent of those in the junior high schools would require extra help if they are to function effectively in high school"[1]

The ghetto is a place of first and last resort; the interim is spent trying to escape from it. Feagin studied the reasons why persons in his sample had located somewhere in Roxbury. He found:[2]

> ... At least, seventy-two percent were forced to enter the housing market by urban renewal, etc., whether or not they actually wanted to do so.... Thus, selectivity--in the sense of a person choosing a project solely in order to increase social interaction--does not seem to be an important factor in the housing choices of most of these Negro families.

In the St. Louis public housing project, poverty ruled out any choice of housing or even of food: "The family is frequently without enough money to plan from one meal to the other."[3]

New migrants to a large city are highly dependent on the ethnic neighborhood. Negroes, according to Choldin, are especially so: "They are most likely to stay in the neighborhood, most likely to feel that it is sufficient for them, and least likely to vist the public places of the city."[1] White southern migrants, on the other hand, regard the white slum as a temporary stopping place; they are not committed to the community; and they are isolated from their non-southern neighbors.[2]

---

[1] Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., Youth in the Ghetto. A Study of the Consequences of Powerlessness and a Blueprint for Change. (New York: HARYOU, 1964), pp. 411-412.

[2] Feagin, The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment, p. 173.

[3] Moore, A Portrait, p. 83.

There is little attachment of the urban Negro to his neighborhood. About one third of a sample of Chicago Negroes thought that their neighborhood was declining. As for a comparison of Negro-white attitudes toward neighborhood, the study found:[3]

> Negroes dislike their neighborhoods much more than whites dislike theirs. Only 19 percent of the Negroes rated their neighborhood as a "very good" place... whereas sixty-two percent of the white respondents made this report.... Negroes who regard their neighborhood as "very good" are less militant than those who regard their neighborhood as "fairly bad" or "very bad."

Respondents were asked to base their opinions on the totality of elements entering into a neighborhood: schools, play facilities, police and fire protection, street cleaning and garbage removal, and public transportation.

Moore writes: "Disadvantaged homes do have an educational tradition .... Its preoccupation is with survival."[4]

---

[1] Choldin, First Year in the Metropolis, p. 83. See, also, Frank T. Cherry, Southern In-Migrant Negroes in North Lawndale, Chicago 1949-59: A Study of Internal Migration and Adjustment (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965).

[2] Edwin S. Harwood, Work and Community Among Urban Newcomers: A Study of the Social and Economic Adaptation of Southern Migrants in Chicago (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1966), pp. 57 and 175.

[3] Interuniversity Social Research Committee--Chicago Metropolitan Area, Militancy for and Against Civil Rights and Integration in Chicago, p.22.

[4] Moore, A Portrait, p. 174.

It would seem that the ghetto neighborhood is not regarded as essential to this tradition.

Moving out of the ghetto is a privilege enjoyed primarily by middle-class Negroes. Even then, only some actually make the move. Bullough studied the social-psychological characteristics of those who moved. She compared middle-class Negroes in (a) predominantly Negro ghetto areas in West Los Angeles and Pacoima, (b) an integrated fringe of Baldwin Hills, and (c) the predominantly white area of the San Fernando Valley. None of the subjects was poor . The median income of Negroes living in the ghetto was $9, 700 while those now living in the integrated areas earned $11, 000. What factors impelled the latter to move from the ghetto?

Bullough found that feelings of alienation and powerlessness were significantly less among those Negroes who had moved.[1] And "the childhood experiences most related to lower powerlessness scores are those of integrated school experience and living in a racially mixed neighborhood while growing up."[2] On the other hand: "Segregation in the past is related to present alienation scores. Experience with segregation seem to have long term psychological consequences which can later influence the behavior of the individual as an adult."[3]

Poverty and discrimination erect the ghetto walls, declares Bullough, but the walls are kept standing also by "the feelings of powerlessness, hopelessness and social distance which have developed out of the segregated experiences of ghetto life."[4] The longer former ghetto residents live in integrated areas, the less do they socialize with former friends in their old neighborhood; and the less the ghetto orientation, the greater the fall in feelings of powerlessness and anomie.[1] Bullough concludes: "The fact that choosing the integrated way of life in one sphere is related to choosing it in others suggests that any sort of program aimed at decreasing segregation is worth trying."[2]

---

[1] Bonnie Louise Bullough, Alienation Among Middle Class Negroes: Social-Psychological Factors Influencing Housing Desegregation (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-16, 517); and "Alienation in the Ghetto," American Journal of Sociology, 72 (1966-1967) 743.

[2] Bullough, "Alienation in the Ghetto," p. 474.

[3] Bullough, Alienation Among Middle-Class Negroes, p. 183.

[4] Ibid., 187.

8. CONCLUSIONS

Inside Negro communities strong support for school desegregation comes from adults who themselves attended desegregated schools. Such adults are friendlier toward whites, seem to have a stronger sense of controlling their environment, and are happier. Adult whites who attended desegregated schools similarly favor desegregation both as a principle and as applied to their own white neighborhood.

Negro pro-desegregation sentiment was strong in Chicago, Detroit, Portland, Montgomery, and Washington, D.C. National polls taken in 1963 and 1966 found that Negro support of desegregation had increased. Numerous demonstrative public actions on behalf of desegregation were taken by organized Negroes; every part of the country was witness to these events.

Negro parents show a growing dissatisfaction with their lack of effective voice in school affairs. A contrary impression finds less and less support in the research evidence.

The ghetto community, which suffers from poverty and cultural encapsulation, is revealed to have its normal share of relationships. The special problems of the ghetto preclude attachment to neighborhood or to other concerns not connected with the daily problems of survival.

---

[1] Bullough, "Alientation in the Ghetto, pp. 474-475.

[2] Ibid., p. 478.

CHAPTER 9

CRITICS OF DESEGREGATION

School desegregation has frequently been a subject of public debate and criticism. Much of this contention related to practical problems of how best to implement desegregation: timing, scope, and pace. Another line of criticism, however, rejects the very idea of desegregation. Such critics may be, in varying degrees, proponents of racism. By racism is meant the belief that a person's race affects his essential capacity to function. The alleged disability is then used to justify differential treatment of the disabled person. Proponents of segregation on principle often defend their advocacy by a claim that the segregated group is intellectually or morally inferior by birth. American racists have claimed to demonstrate the racial inferiority of Negroes by citing differential I.Q. test scores consistently in favor of whites. In recent years racist attempts to demonstrate conclusively the intellectual inferiority of Negroes have taken on new life.[1]

Not all critics of desegregation, however, are racists. Opposition may also be incidental to a particular world view or political philosophy. Nevertheless, the consequence is the same in either case. In the remainder of this chapter we will be interested in racist and non-racist criticisms of desegregation. The primary concern will be in examining the factual basis of the viewpoint rather than in the viewpoint itself.

---

[1] See Isabella Black, "Race and Unreason: Anti-Negro Opinion in Professional and Scientific Literature Since 1954," Phylon, Spring, 1965; and I.A. Newby, Challenge to the Court. Social Scientists and the Defense of Segregation, 1954-1966 (Baton Rouge: Louisana State University, 1967).

1. THE SHUEY BOOK

In 1966 was published the second edition of The Testing of Negro Intelligence by Shuey.[1] It is a compendium of the findings of about 450 comparative studies and discussions of the intelligence of Negro and white persons, mostly children. "It is not the purpose of this book," according to the author, "to prove that Negroes are socially, morally, or intellectually inferior to whites; nor is its purpose to demonstrate that Negroes are the equal of or are superior to whites in these several characteristics."[2] At the conclusion of her review of findings, however, she held that these demonstrated "the presence of native differences between Negroes and whites as determined by intelligence tests."[3] Although she did not state the magnitude of these differences, in a review of tests of children's intelligence she reported a fourteen point difference between white and Negro I.Q. scores in studies made over a forty-three year period.[4]

The book has virtually no relevance to a study of the effects of desegregation. Only a single study of the 450 deals specifically with this subject and Shuey reports correctly that the desegregated Negro children benefited significantly. This is Katzenmeyer's study, discussed earlier in Chapter II. Otherwise, Shuey fails to examine any of the mass of desegregation studies then available; her preface is dated March, 1966. A desegregation study is one that compares, say, the achievement of the same children before and after desegregation, with appropriate controls. The absence of references to such studies in the book's section entitled "Controlling education and socioeconomic environment" is especially puzzling, for in a real sense this is what a good many desegregation studies aim at. None of the indexed references to "integrated schools" deals with desegregation; Katzenmeyer's study, which does, is not listed under "integrated schools." But even that study is belittled.

---

[1] Audrey M. Shuey, The Testing of Negro Intelligence, 2nd, ed. (New York: Social Science Press, 1966).

[2] Ibid., p. 1.

[3] Ibid., pp. 520-521.

[4] Ibid., p. 493.

The reader will recall that Katzenmeyer found the Negro children in desegregated schools gained 6.54 I.Q. points and white children only 0.50 during the two-year test period; this he attributed to the beneficial effects of interracial interaction and the high level of schooling for all children in Jackson, Michigan. Shuey notes, however, that while white children in desegregated schools gained 0.60 I.Q. points, white children in all-white schools gained 3.21 points. She concludes from this that the greater gain by the latter "is traceable to the *absence of social interaction* between the two races."[1] While this is possible, a much greater probability is that the difference in white achievement reflects a social class difference. Unfortunately, Katzenmenmeyer did not record socioeconomic data. (His study was a census of all children in the respective grades and thus did not require matching data.)

There is also a logical difficulty in accepting a negative reason as an explanation of an event. The universe of negatives is infinite. Thus, in seeking to verify or contradict a negative, one must always be prepared to weigh one negative against another. So, if a differential gain is to be explained by the absence of social interaction, it is just as logical to attribute it to the absence of instruction or books or anxiety. There is no way of deciding what not to exclude as an explanation. On the other hand, the universe of positives is relatively limited. By asserting that an event is to be explained by the presence of a specific condition, we can test for its presence. Even after we verify its presence, that doesn't end matters for additional positives can be specified; or, a new perspective can change the relevance of old positives. Consequently, it is less satisfactory to attribute the 2.61 I.Q. point difference between white students to the absence of social interaction--or the absence of anything--than to attempt to account for it by socioeconomic differences. Nevertheless, the matter requires an empirical test which is not possible at this point. It would seem a simple task to have performed the test.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

Somewhat related problems arise in the course of Shuey's review of Tanser's study.[1] He studied intelligence differences among Negro and white children attending the same schools in Kent County, Ontario; six schools were rural, one was urban. Median I.Q. scores were grouped by the color and place of residence of the children tested as follows:[2]

		Urban	Rural
Grades 1 and 2	White	98.41	92.0
	Negro	79.50	84.5
Grades 3 and 8	White	109.76	110.60
		94.81	96.67

One can make a number of things out of these findings. Note, as Shuey does not, that the urban Negro children's median is 15.31 points higher in later grades; the corresponding white differential is 11.35 points. Shuey does observe that in the third to eighth grade group, white scores are higher in each grade but that the difference diminishes after the fourth grade.[3] She attributes the later relative gain by Negroes to a "process of selection which takes place among the Negroes."[4] This process is not described. It must also be noted that we are speaking of the Negro children who attended the single urban school in Chatham. Shuey reports that "the socioeconomic status of the urban colored was without doubt inferior to that of the whites in the city of Chatham."[1] It seems warranted to conclude that Negro achievement in the urban school was extraordinary, given the distinctly unfavorable social circumstances of the Negro children. Despite social handicaps, the achievement gap between Negro and white grew smaller.

---

[1] Harry A. Tanser, The Settlement of Negroes in Kent County, Ontario, and A Study of the Mental Capacity of Their Descendants (Chatham, Ontario: Sheperd Publishers, 1939).

[2] Shuey, pp. 77 and 87.

[3] Ibid., p. 101.

[4] Ibid.

What of the Negro children in the six rural schools? As the listing above shows, the white median score is 18, 50 points higher in the upper than in the lower grades; the corresponding figure for Negro children is 12.17 points. (Note that the Negro rural difference was larger than the white urban difference.) It is likely that at least part of the discrepancy between the two groups of rural children can be accounted for by socioeconomic differences.

In his forword to Shuey's book, Garrett explains that "inequities in the environment render it difficult to make fair comparison between many Negro and white groups, though fair comparisons can be--and have been-made by a careful equating of background variables."[2] In the body of her work, however, Shuey refers to "the comparable _but not equated_ groups of rural Negro and white children"... in Kent County.[3] The concrete question at stake here is whether the 6.33 point difference is a socioeconomic or racial differential. While fairly sizable, it could be accounted for by socioeconomic factors. But a possibility is not yet a disproof. It would, however, seem necessary to exert more exact controls of variables if exact findings are to be given so weighty an interpretation.

A final comment on I.Q. scores: Kennedy and associates' study of Negro children in the Southeast has been described in Chapter 2, above, and is mentioned several times by Shuey. The mean I.Q. score was found to be 80.7. Shuey interprets the Kennedy finding as though I.Q. scores were

---

1. _Ibid._, p. 68.
2. Henry E. Garrett in _ibid._, p. vii.
3. _Ibid._, p. 68 (Emphasis added).

natural objects with fixed meanings. Kennedy, on the other hand, observes: "The clinician in the field has learned that a Negro child who, in spite of the cultural deficits facing him, scores an I.Q. of 100 must be a superior child indeed to surmount these enormous difficulties."[1] The orientation of the Shuey book has no room for such cultural facts, for it is too concerned with the arithmetic of intelligence differences.[2]

2. THE WRITINGS OF GARRETT

In 1947, Garrett did not believe it possible to speak meaningfully of racial differences in mental ability:[3]

> ... The differences between American Negroes and American whites are not true racial differences.... Comparisons of Negroes and whites within the United States can hardly reveal true race differences....

For unexplained reasons, however, Garrett changed his view radically and became the chief American spokesman for an opposite doctrine. In 1967, while testifying before a not-unfriendly U.S. Senate Subcommittee, Garrett declared:[4]

> ... The black people are immature relative to the white. They are more primitive, they are more childlike, their abstract intelligence is on the average

---

[1] Kennedy and others, The Standardization of the 1960 Revision of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale on Negro.

[2] See Robert A. Hicks and Robert J. Pellegrini, "The Meaningfulness of Negro-white Differences in Intelligence Test Performance," Psychological Record, January, 1966.

[3] Henry E. Garrett, "Negro-White Differences in Mental Ability in the United States," Scientific Monthly, 65 (1947) 333 and 329 (emphasis in original).

[4] Henry E. Garrett, "Garrett's Stuff," Integrated Education, 6 (1968) 42.

considerably lower.

He referred to African history for documentation of the limited capacity of black people for abstract thought.

Garrett's articles and pamphlets of are probably the most widely circulated anti-desegregation literature. Four separate publications contain his main ideas on desegregation.[1] None of these cites or discusses a single controlled study of the desegregation process. Tanser's study is reviewed as is one by McGurk.[2] Neither study involved a sample population which had been segregated and then which was desegregated. Garrett was aware, of course, of the existence of studies of environmental influences on the intelligence but he disposed of them summarily: "But most of this evidence isn't evidence at all, but is wishful thinking. Therefore, it is omitted here."[3] In establishing an intelligence differential between Negro and white, Garrett cites the findings of the Kennedy study, and studies by Osborne and Project Talent. As "three examples of desegregation" he cites Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, and New York. In each case he ignored controlled studies or reports in psychological and educational journals related to

---

1. Henry E. Garrett, Desegregation: Fact and Hokum (Richmond, Virginia: Patrick Henry Press, n.d.); "How Classroom Desegregation Works," Citizen, February, 1966; "How Classroom Desegregation Will Work," Citizen, October, 1965; and How Classroom Desegregation Will Work, 5th ed. (Richmond, Virginia: Patrick Henry Press, 1966). The latter two items differ only in very minor ways. A new edition of the last item was published in 1968; Children: Black and White (Richmond, Virginia, Patrick Henry Press, 1968).

2. F. C. J. McGurk, Comparison of the Performance of Negro and White High School Seniors on Cultural and Non-Cultural Psychological Test Questions (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1956).

3. Garrett, "How Classroom Desegregation Will Work," p.5.

desegregation in those cities.[1]

Here is a list of conclusions and observations on desegregation by Garrett:

> 1. ... Lowering the standards to accommodate the Negro pupil would deny the white pupil his maximum potential and would have the effect of nullifying the nationwide attempt to strengthen education at all levels.[1]

---

[1] See references for these cities in Meyer Weinberg (ed.), School Integration. A Comprehensive Classified Bibliography of 3,100 References (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1967), pp. 12-13 (Washington, D.C.), 10-11 (California), and 20-26 (New York). Materials for a systematic assessment of public schools in Washington, D.C. can be found in: George D. Strayer, The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949); U.S. Congress, 84th, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the District of Columbia, Subcommittee to Investigate Public School Standards and Conditions and Juvenile Delinquency in the District of Columbia, Investigation of Public School Conditions (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956). Ellis O. Knox, Democracy and the District of Columbia Schools. A Study of Recently Integrated Public Schools (Washington, D.C.: Judd and Detweiler, 1957); U.S. Congress, 89th, 1st and 2nd sessions, House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Task Force on Anti-poverty in the District of Columbia, Investigation of the Schools and Poverty in the District of Columbia. Hearings (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966); Hobson v. Hansen, Congressional Record, June 21, 1967, pp. H7655-H7697; and A. Harry Passow, Toward Creating a Model Urban School System; A Study of the Washington, D.C. Public Schools (New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University September, 1967).

[2] Garrett, How Classroom Desegregation Will Work p.11.

2. The patrons of a newly-desegregated high school can look forward to lower academic performance, more dropouts, greater incidence of absenteeism, higher costs, and fewer graduates going to college. These will occur in direct proportion to the number of Negroes enrolled. Delinquency also increases as the percentage of Negroes rises.[1]

3. "Judging the probable future from the known past, wholesale desegregation of public school will tend, first, to demoralization, next, to disorganization, and eventually to ruin or complete ineffectiveness.[2]

4. It is painfully evident that desegregation and "quality' education are incompatible.[3]

5. The Federal agencies are deliberately sacrificing the country's talent in a futile attempt to accomplish the impossible: To 'equalize' the Negro child of 80 I.Q. with the white child of 100 I.Q.[4]

6. Because the Negro's brain is inferior in some respects it is ... manifestly unfair to force the Negro child to compete against white students on white standards.... It is equally ... unfair to force white children to forego their opportunities for quality education in order not to embarrass the slow-learning Negro. Such educational 'breeding down' can result only in cultural and educational disaster.[5]

7. The 'matching' studies agree that educational and sociological factors do not lessen significantly

---

[1] Ibid., p.13.
[2] Ibid., p. 19.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid., p.21.

Negro-white differences in mental tests.[1]

8. ... It is clear that desegregation will not pull the Negro up to white standards. To the contrary, desegregation will pull down the white child. Every item of evidence points this way.[2]

9. The greater the number of Negroes assigned to tasks beyond their ability, the greater their frustration, the greater their frustration, the greater their adverse reaction.[3]
10. It is clear, we cannot have complete desegregation of our classrooms and first-class education.[4]

Let us examine the relation of these generalizations to the research evidence.

Garrett's first point assumes that academic standards fall when Negroes enter a heretofore white school. This stricture has no application to the controlled research studies reviewed in earlier chapters because these studies used the same I.Q. and achievement tests for Negro and white. When differential rates of achievement were noted, there were genuine gains and not the results of declining standards.

Points 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 contend that when Negroes desegregate a white school, the average level of achievement falls. The research evidence reviewed in Chapter II, above, contradicts this contention. Almost always the average level of achievement rises; in a very few cases, the level remains unchanged.

Points 1, 6, and 8 maintain that academic achievement of whites in desegregated schools falls either absolutely or relatively. This view is contradicted by virtually every piece of controlled research into actual classroom desegregation. See Chapter 2, above.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 24. (emphasis in original).
[2] Ibid., p.23.
[3] Ibid., p. 25.
[4] Ibid.

Point 2 alleges that desegregation brings with it a decline in the number of graduates going to college. On the contrary, the Racial Isolation study showed that Negro students in desegregated schools are more likely than Negro students in segregated schools to go to college; no evidence in the same study indicated a reduction in the number of white students going to college.[1] Gordon's study of Oak Park, Michigan, High School demonstrated the increase in college-going intentions by desegregated Negro students while white students maintained the level of their college expectations; see Chapter 3, above.

Points 2, 3, and 9 allege that some sort of school disorganization results from desegregation. The Racial Isolation study found student achievement in desegregated schools to thrive in the absence of interracial strife in the school. Interracial strife was not regarded as inevitable but rather within the power of school authorities to control. Gunthorpe found Negro children in a desegregated school had a better attendance record than white students, and no worse record in truancies.[2] Alan B. Wilson found in Richmond, California that delinquency of Negro youth was strongly related to segregation, not desegregation.[3] As we saw, however, Wilson theorized that the school could counteract any tendency toward delinquency by "integrating" the lower-class student--Negro or white--into the activities of the school.

Point 7 is contradicted by more than one controlled study. Katzenmeyer, as we have seen, documented a highly significant narrowing of the Negro-white gap; Wolman in New Rochelle did likewise.

Point 9 raises a question that has evoked much bewonderment: If a disadvantaged child is placed in a classroom where his peers are far ahead of him, will he not become demoralized? When Katz asked rhetorically why such a child did not, in fact, become demoralized, he replied that he did not know.[1] He proceeded, however, to theorize that such a child gained an indispensable chance to measure himself more realistically and, perhaps, more mercifully. This was a step toward more effective motivation for further learning. In addition, there remains the puzzle of how really able is any student. Two previous findings are relevant: (1) Chesler and Segal's finding that half the white teachers changed their minds who had originally thought the Negro students would be unable to do as well as white students; and (2) Rosenthal's finding that student performance may be highly dependent on the teacher's expectation.

---

[1] Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II, pp. 58-60 and 143-147.

[2] Gunthorpe, A Comparison of Negro and White Student Participation in Selected Classes of a Junior High School, p. 108.

[3] Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II, p. 201.

In 1968, Garrett published a new edition of his pamphlet, re-titled Children: Black and White.[2] He continued to cite lags by Negro students in achievement and intelligence tests as evidence of genetic racial inferiority of Negroes. One such study in the southeastern United States was that by Kennedy and associates; as we saw earlier (p. they found a lag by Negro children in 1960 and 1965. Unlike Garrett, however, Kennedy declares that "in the southeastern United States at the present time race is hopelessly confounded with socioeconomic variables which cannot be extracted."[3] Nor does Garrett acknowledge that he compared scores of Negro children in the Southeast with scores of a national population of whites. Wallace and associates had remarked earlier on the need for a new normative study of white intelligence and achievement in the Southeast.

Garrett cites data from a 1963 Project TALENT report which show that achievement test scored tended to fall as the percent Negro in classrooms rose.[1] It should be noted that this project asked its respondents no racial questions until 1965. On the basis of the new data, apparently only a single Project TALENT study has been made, that by Kapel. He concluded that from his study "it has become rather obvious that the proportion of Negroes attending a school, per se, might not be as important as regional and community differences among schools in the United States."[2]

---

[1] See above, Chapter IV.

[2] Henry E. Garrett, Children: Black and White (Kilmarnock, Virginia: Patrick Henry Press /1968/. See, also Garrett, book review in Mankind Quarterly, 9 (1968) 88.

[3] Kennedy, A Follow-up Normative Study of Negro Intelligence and Achievement, p. 21.

Garrett still fails to cite and/or discuss a single statistically controlled study of desegregation. None of these studies referred to in the present volume is even mentioned in the old or new Garrett editions.

In conclusion, Garrett's writings on school desegregation must be adjudged highly insubstantial. The fundamental defect discussed here is not their viewpoint-about which much could be said--but their lack of support in the research literature.

3. THE VIEWS OF C.P. ARMSTRONG

Psychologist Armstrong has recently formulated a psychological approach against desegregation.[3] The elements of it are as follows:

---

[1] Garrett, Children: Black and White, p. 14.

[2] David E. Kapel, Effects of Negro Density on Student Variables and the Post-High School Adjustment of Male Negroes (Palo Alto, California: Project TALENT, American Institutes for Research, 1968), p. 71.

[3] Clairette P. Armstrong, Psychodiagnosis, Prognosis, School Desegregation and Delinquency (New York: International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, n.d.), reprinted from Mankind Quarterly, October-December, 1964; see, also, Armstrong and A. James Gregor, "Integrated Schools and Negro Character Development: Some Considerations of the Possible Effects," Psychiatry, February, 1964.

1. Mass integration will create many unhappy misfit Negro school children--today's incipient truants and juvenile court cases, often tomorrow's criminals.[1]

2. ... Harm may stem from integration for many reasons including discernible, unavoidable, inevitable comparisons with whites--even skin color itself.... To arouse their [Negro children's] unrealizable expectations that school desegregation will transform them into smart scholars can be psychologically devastating.[2]

3. Rarely indeed does improved opportunity raise an I.Q. of a normal child irrespective of color, nor does classroom mixing of low and high I.Q's improve the dull by contagion.[3]

4. But the really serious and cruel psychological trauma to average Negro children is educational integration with younger, brighter white classmates.[4]

5. Negro children who watch other Negro children operate ineffectively in a desegregated situation come to assess their own group as inferior.[5]

6. Desegregated schools worsen the plight of most Negro children causing maladjustment, lasting trauma, unhappiness and delinquency.[6]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 1.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 14.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

7. Segregated schools are helpful to the average Negro child scholastically and temperamentally.[7]

Point 1 is considered by Armstrong to be of major importance, but it is essentially the same as Garrett's Point 2; see comments thereon.

Armstrong's Point 2 is close to Garrett's Point 6. An opportunity to compare may turn out to have a most constructive effect on the child's self-conception. One may recall the bright Negro girls in Singer's study who *now* knew they were brighter than many white children. Or, Negro youths in the Chesler-Segal study who, after desegregation, saw themselves as fully equal to their white peers. Armstrong's Points 5 and 6 seem to assume that in a desegregated classroom Negroes will always turn out to be the dull ones. The research studies do not support such a supposition. When slower Negro students see brighter Negro students alongside slower white students, we can expect a more realistic self-conception as individual and as Negro.

Point 3 misses one of the most significant findings of recent social-psychological research--the importance of the classroom peer-group for individual learning. The Berkeley and the Richmond studies by Alan B. Wilson and the findings of the Office of Education and the Commission on Civil Rights studies underscore the significance of this group factor. The process whereby this influence is communicated is far more complex than "contagion" which conjures up a picture of discrete micro-organisms flitting hither and yon. There is, as a matter of fact, a great deal about this process that the researchers still don't know. Unhappily, however, the research literature does support the proposition that desegregation may be harmful to the Negro child. As Katz indicated, a prerequsite for a truly integrated school is an atmosphere of acceptance and mutual respect. In the absence of such support, desegregation may lose a good part of its favorable impact.

---

1. *Ibid.*

Armstrong's Point 7 is contradicted wholesale by the research literature of desegregation. Armstrong does not cite any cases of segregation benefiting a Negro child's scholastic perfromance. In Chapter 3, above, we saw several instances wherein desegregation did not increase Negro achievement. But such cases were in a distinct minority. As for the temperamental benefits of segregation, again Armstrong refers to no studies or specific cases. On the other hand, the work of Blake, Haggstron, and Singer, among others, strongly contradicts Armstrong's view.

Armstrong's perspective differs from Garrett's primarily in that it attempts to some degree to account for the psychodynamics of desegregation. Lacking, apparently, any contact with contemporary research on desegregation, however, Armstrong is thrown back on a priori reasoning which does not even have the advantage of first-hand contact with current desegregation experience.

4. VAN DEN HAAG'S VIEW

Van den Haag interprets desegregation as an impairment of the education of both white and Negro children.[1] Along with Garrett and Armstrong, he believes that whites would be held back by disadvantaged Negroes entering the classroom while the latter could not receive adequate attention in such a classroom. Several of his points follow:

> 1. I am all in favor of improving the quality of education for all. But this can be done only if pupils are separated according to ability (whatever determines it). And this means very largely according to race.[2]

---

[1] Ernest van den Haag, Negroes, Intelligence and Prejudice (New York: International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, Inc., n.d.), p.3 (reprinted from National Review, December 1, 1964).

[2] Ibid.

2. The learning ability of Negro children on the average is not as responsive at present as that of white children to the stimulation given by average white schools.... Desegregation is neither necessary nor sufficient to eliminate these disadvantages /of poor original environment and other possibly inherent factors/; and it would not help the average pupil of either group.[1]

3. ... Negroes and whites should be educated separately--unless there is evidence in specific cases that the learning of neither group suffers from congregation / desegregation/ and that neither group objects.[2]

Let us examine these points.

Point 1 asserts that ability grouping is a prerequisite to improved education for all, even if it becomes largely grouping by race. The burden of a great deal of research on ability grouping is that the practice is not demonstrably beneficial or harmful for school achievement.[3] From a practical view, the elimination of ability grouping has been found beneficial in one well-known desegregation experiment--Greenburgh District No. 8 in New York.[4] Van den Haag is contemplating what would be segregated classrooms within a desegregated school or separation by school altogether. In both cases, research evidence is relevant.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] See Jane Franseth and Rose Koury, Survey of Research on Grouping as Related to Pupil Learning (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966); and Donald Vandenberg, "Ideology and Educational Policy," Journal of Educational Thought, April, 1967

[4] See Aaron Lipton, "Classroom Grouping and Integration," Integrated Education, February-March, 1964; "Day-to-Day Problems of School Integration," Integrated Education, June-July, 1965.

Education of Negro and white children in separate buildings has been an historic failure. Education in separate classrooms within a formally desegregated building is no better. To repeat McPartland's finding from a national sample: "Segregated classes may be more detrimental for Negro student achievement if they occur in mostly white schools rather than mostly Negro schools."[1] The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights points out that "the root of the problem is continued academic disadvantage."[2] Thus far, academic disadvantage has not yielded to remediation within a framework of racial isolation.

Point 2 really raises the issue of whether below-average disadvantaged students can gain by desegregation. So long as we view this question from a purely individual perspective, the answer is very difficult. But the question also, or even largely, involves group perspective. As the Commission on Civil Rights found:[3]

> There is ... a strong relationship between the attitudes and achievement of students and the social class composition of their schools. Disadvantaged students--especially Negroes--are more strongly influenced by the student environment than advantaged students. This relationship grows stronger over time. Although family and school social class factors vary in their individual importance at different grade levels, their combined influence always is great.

It would seem that the desegregating Negro student, whatever his ability and social class, stands to gain much from desegregation. Whether he will in fact do so may be more a question of school organization than level of individual ability.

---

1. McPartland, The Relative Influence of School Desegregation and of Classroom Desegregation on the Academic Achievement of Ninth Grade Negro Students, p.4.
2. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, I, p.162.
3. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, I, p.86.

Point 3 asserts the permissibility of desegregated education where it has not been demonstrably harmful to achievement. Research studies reviewed in Chapter 2, above, refer to a number of such cases. A further question would seem to be in order: If these, why not others? The added requirement in Point 3 that the congregants also not object to the congregating means one thing if white students themselves are polled and another if their parents are polled.

5. GREGOR CRITIQUE

A. James Gregor has criticized desegregation from another point of view.[1] It will be recalled that Gregor was the co-author of an article with C.P. Armstrong; see footnote 1, page 360, above. In his article the following statements are made:

> 1. The evidence does, in fact, indicate that Negro children in 'integrated' situations in non-Southern standard metropolitan areas suffer in greater measure and intensity the psychodynamic impairments attributed to segregation by the liberal social scientists and consultants for the NAACP.[2]
>
> 2. ... Negro children in 'integrated' situations suffer as many and perhaps more personality impairments as those educated in a racially homogenous environment.[3]
>
> 3. The evidence in this respect is consistent. Under existing conditions the integration of the

---

[1] A. James Gregor, "Black Nationalism: A Preliminary Analysis of Negro Radicalism," *Science and Society*, Fall, 1963.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 429.

[3] *Ibid.*

> Negro child in the school situation places him under enormous intra-psychic tension.[1]
>
> 4. Under conditions prevailing in the United States, the integration on non-white minority children undoubtedly generates a special kind of psychic tension to which they are not subject in racially insultated environments.[2]
>
> 5. ... Racial separation, at least during critical periods of personality formation, may materially enhance the formation of a coherent self-system on the part of the Negro child by reducing the psychological pressure to which he is subject.[3]
>
> 6. In the integration of ... the Negro radical's children into predominantly white schools he sees the initial phase of the process of self-rejection and intergroup hostility that breeds, in part, the high urban Negro delinquency and crime rate that constitutes the nucleus of the Negro stereotype, which in turn provides the necessary conditions for the next cycle of white anti-Negro bias and the ravages to be effected on the 'integrated' Negro child.[4]

Gregor identifies the Negro radical with "Negro proletarian radicalism."

Two separate issues are involved in Gregor's points: (1) Given the essential segregative school conditions, North and South, do Negro children fare any better in northern than in southern schools? (2) Does desegregation offer the potentialty of healthier personality development of Negro children?

Gregor contends that the segregated school helps form

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid., p.430.
[3] Ibid., p.431.
[4] Ibid., p.432.

"a coherent self system." Holland has countered this view:[1]

> Since segregation, as a component of our case organization, acts as an agent of further deprivation for the Negro child, it cannot be considered a solution to his problems of adjustment. Indeed, the imposition of segregation on a group which is aware of the etiology of this segregation in community attitudes about Negro inferiority, may engender anger and resentment, overt and covert hostility. These feelings may be internalized and lead to certain types of character formation, with impaired ego development and a burgeoning of impulses which may be acted out against society or turned against the self in the form of self-destructive behavior. The Negro child then enters adulthood unequipped academically and psychologically to make his maximum contribution to the society in which he lives.

In other words, the segregated child's self-system becomes disrupted rather than coherent. Anti-social behavior thus is expressive of segregation rather than of desegregation.

On the second issue, ample evidence testifies to the constructive personality effects of desegregation upon the Negro child. (See Chapter 3, above.) Gregor's article does not cite a single desegregation study which resulted in harmful personality consequences for the Negro child.

Children can suffer under segregation and desegregation. The weight of research evidence suggests that the harm is greater under segregation.

More recently, Gregor has continued to write in seeming isolation from contemporary social empirical research into desegregation.[1]

---

[1] Florence N. Holland, "A Comment on the Segregated Learning Situation as an Insulating Device for the Negro Child," Psychiatry, August, 1964, p. 303.

6. ARENDT AND "FORCED INTEGRATION"

Looking at a photograph of a Negro girl being pursued by a white mob as she was returning home from a newly desegregated Little Rock high school, Hannah Arendt concluded that "forced integration" was wrong.[2] She made four major points. First, if she were a Negro mother, Miss Arendt stated, "under no circumstances would I expose my child to conditions which made it appear as though it wanted to push its way into a group where it was not wanted.... I would feel that the Supreme Court ruling, unwillingly but unavoidably, has put my child into a more humiliating position than it has been in before."[3] Better education for Negro children can be won, she continued, by fighting "for an improvement of schools for Negro children" as well as special classes for children who are to desegregate.

Second, if she were a white mother, Miss Arendt supposed, "I would agree that the government has a stake in the education of my child insofar as this child is supposed to grow up into a citizen, but I would deny that the government had any right to tell me in whose company my child received its instruction."[1] If she were a strong believer in integrated education, Miss Arendt wrote that she would organize a private, purely voluntary integrated school.

---

[1] See A. James Gregor, "On Learned Ignorance: A Brief Inquiry into I.A. Newby's Challenge to the Court," pp. 237-266 and "Social Science Research and the Education of the Minority-Group Child," pp. 267-283 in I.A. Newby, Challenge to the Court, 2nd ed. (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1969).

[2] See Hannah Arendt, "Reflections on Little Rock," Dissent, Winter, 1959; "A Reply to Critics," ibid., Spring, 1959; and letter in ibid.; David Spitz, "Politics and the Realms of Being--A Reply," ibid., Winter, 1959; Melvin Tumin, "Pie in the Sky: A Reply," ibid.; letters by Sidney Hook, Dan Cooperman, Charles H. Foster, Laura H. Ryne, and Edward E. Malkin, all in ibid., Spring, 1959; and letter by Margaret Halsey, ibid., Summer, 1959.

[3] Arendt, "A Reply to Critics," p. 179.

Third, she held that the most pernicious racist suffering was imposed upon Negroes by the southern practice of forbidding racial intermarriage. This deprivation was far more fundamental than school segregation. Therefore, concluded Miss Arendt, school desegregation is an evasion by white liberals of the really tough racial problem. (See Table 1 .)

Table .1

Negroes' Evaluation of Rights Most Important To Be Worked for Now[2]

(Percent Choosing Item as Most Important)

	Percent
Equal job opportunities	58
Voting rights	13
Desegregation of public schools	13
Desegregation of public places	3
No discrimination in housing	1
Can't choose one	7
No answer	5

Fourth, she observed that "the idea that one can change the world by educating the children in the spirit of the future has been one of the hallmarks of political utopias since antiquity. The trouble with this idea has always been the same; it can succeed only if the children are really separated from their parents and brought up in state institutions, or are indoctrinated in school so that they will turn against their own parents."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 180.

[2] NORC Survey SRS-160, May, 1963, in Mildred A. Schwartz, Trends in White Attitudes Toward Negroes (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1967), p.6.

The first point hinges on the matter of humiliation.[2] Coles, having met with numerous white and black southerners, child and adult alike, who were involved in actual desegregation, observes that Negro parents have been most reluctant to permit their children to enter white schools. Often, it is the children who initiated the process. Coles found this to be especially true in Atlanta; Chesler and Segal, in Alabama, found that the Negro parents were permissive and encouraging but did not take the initiative. Meketon's research in Kentucky demonstrates the wholesome effect upon Negro children of a determined and successful parents' movement to force the desegregation of a school. The humiliation lies in continuing to prepare for a racial order in which "from their first years Negro children must learn who they are, where they may not go, what they most probably will be and cannot be."[3]

---

1. Arendt, "A Reply to Critics," p. 181.

2. A view parallel to that of Miss Arendt's is van den Haag, "Social Science Testimony in the Desegregation Cases--A Reply to Professor Kenneth Clark," Villanova Law Review (Fall, 1960, p. 71). "I cannot imagine that being resented and shunned personally and concretely by their white schoolmates throughout every day would be less humiliating to Negro children than a general abstract knowledge that they are separately educated because of white prejudice." Van den Haag thus characterizes the psychological consequences of segregation upon the child as mere "abstract knowledge." However, see, also, A.J. Muste: "I sometimes think that the gulf between the people who have experienced humiliation as a people and those who have not is the deepest and most significant we have to face and that contemplation of it and awareness of its meaning is the chief essential for dealing with contemporary problems"; "The Civil Rights Movement and the American Establishment," Liberation, February, 1965, p. 10.

3. Coles, Children of Crisis, p. 321; see, also, p. 379 for an example of a mother of an early desegregation pioneer.

Tumin has replied to Miss Arendt's second point:[1]

> But doesn't Miss A., obviously a great partisan of private schools, know that parents may send their children to private schools if they wish? They don't have to send them to integrated public schools. And if they can't afford private schools? Ah, how sad indeed. For what then, one wishes to whisper, what then of Negro children and their parents and their rights" Where in the fabric of Miss A.'s minimum government do these rights get respected and protected?

Spitz comments that desegregation does not mean "forced integration," for white parents can still send their children to private schools or discriminate in other ways. "What desegregation requires," Spitz emphasized, "is that the state shall not ... prevent white and Negro students from associating with one another...."[2]

In stating her third point, Miss Arendt had observed that "oppressed minorities were never the best judges on the order of priorities" and thus Negroes wrongfully considered the ban on intermarriage to be less important than school desegregation. Spitz replied that "what is today possible, and what is today sought first by those who are oppressed, is not the right to be accepted as a brother-in-law, but as a brother."[3]

Miss Arendt's fourth point fails to come to terms with considerable evidence. "In a sense," Coles writes, "white and Negro children have more in common with each other than with their parents. They share a historical moment that can be painful to them regardless of race. We have seen white school children in the South suffer with shame as they slowly begin to realize what Negro classmates must

---

1. Tumin, "Pie in the Sky," p. 71.
2. Spitz, "Politics and the Realms of Being," p.61.
3. Ibid., p. 63.

endure."[1] In Chapter 4, above, we saw that white children in desegregated schools were less prejudiced than the adult white community. Tumin writes:[2]

> But every decent reporter who has visited the South and talked with school children reports that the children are far more ready and able than their parents to work side by side with Negroes, and share their common school facilities.... What Miss A. finds to be a cruel dumping of a problem on tender children turns out to be instead a process which even segregationists recognize, and fight bitterly, namely, that school children can get on together much better than their parents, and that if their parents let them alone, they will work out ways of working and living together in the schools.

7. ETHNIC LEARNING STYLE AND SEGREGATION

In October, 1968, hearings began in the Federal District Court of Southern Mississippi, in Jackson, on the school segregation case U.S.A. v. Hinds County School District. The federal government contended that the free-choice method of desegregation had allowed a dual school system to operate in Hinds County; a more effective remedy for segregation was sought. The school board replied that free choice had led to substantial progress toward desegregation. Further, a theory of ethnic learning styles was presented in justification of two kinds of schools.

Chief defense attorney Leonard described the theory:[3]

---

[1] Coles, Children of Crisis, p. 322.

[2] Tumin, "Pie in the Sky," pp. 68-69; see, also, Tumin, Desegregation: Resistance and Readiness (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

[3] Testimony in U.S.A. v. Hinds County School District, Civil Action No. 4075, Court Reporter's Transcript, October 8, 1968, T 384-386. The attorney was the Hon. George S. Leonard.

> ... We intend to show ... that ethnic patterns exist as between ... white and Negro children ... [and] that these different patterns actually require entirely different educational treatment. That in fact where you have a school which is predominantly white or predominantly Negro, you are going to have a school which is better adapted educationally.... But let us suppose now that we are dealing with people who regardless of their social circumstances or otherwise have a distinctive learning pattern who can learn in one way the other group cannot. It would be depriving one group or the other of what we might call equal educational opportunity to force it into either a curriculum designed for the other group or into a curriculum which is simply a mishmash of both sides.... What we can show now is that there is a distinct ethnic pattern.

Leonard then called on two expert witnesses for support. Osborne was one.[1]

"Q. Well, what would be the result if you take a child going to school which is matched to one of those curves [of achievement test data] in terms of its rate of progress, the content and subject matter of its courses, and the instructional strategy used by the teachers as against going to another school which was designed to meet a different ethnic pattern?

A. He would be misplaced.

Q. ... If a child has his choice between a school which is matched to his ethnic abilities and a school which is matched to the ethnic pattern of a different group, what would his best educational choice be for the development of his own abilities?

A. To me it would it would be obvious to select one that is compatible with his abilities.

Q. And would freedom of choice under those circumstances be desirable from an educational point of view?

---

[1] Professor R. Travis Osborne, University of Georgia, psychologist.

A. My answer would be yes, if he is apprised of these, of the abilities and can make a wise choice, has help in making a wise decision."[1]

Garrett, another defense expert witness, was asked what studies had "been made in patterning the abilites of the different ethnic groups?" He referred to studies by Stodolsky and Lesser and by Jensen, although he did not indicate specific articles or monographs.[2]

As we saw in Chapter 2 above, Lesser and Stodolsky do not claim yet that their findings of ethnic styles have any classroom application. Osborne and Garrett implied the opposite, without in any way reporting the researchers' own reservations. Indeed, none of the four defense experts[3] objected when defense attorneys used the term "ethnic learning style"or "patterning" to describe merely the profile of mean scores on standard achievement tests administered to students in predominantly white and predominantly Negro schools. This is far from the Lesser-Stodolsky concept. As for Jensen, in none of his major writings has he advocated the importance of ethnic learning style as a main component of cognition, or more narrowly, academic achievement.

It is warranted, therefore, to conclude that ethnic learning style was used for ideological purposes. Perhaps, given the social-political context of desegregation, this is inevitable.

8. MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTARIES

In a 1956 pamphlet, still being circulated by the Citizens Council, Sass explained his opposition to desegregation. He pointed out that "if the small children of the two races in approximately equal numbers--as would be the case in a great many of the South's schools--were brought together intimately and constantly and grew up in close association in integrated schools under teachers necessarily committed to the gospel of racial integration, there would be many in whom race preference would not develop."[1] One could hardly ask for a better restatement of the conclusion reached eleven years later by the United State Commission on Civil Rights' Racial Isolation study!

---

[1] Transcript, T 399-T 400.

[2] Ibid., T 408.

[3] The others were Ernest van den Haag and Frank McGurk.

Josey states that in some situations, propinquity leads to interracial friendship; he cites examples of integrated military units, merchant seamen, and some residential developments. "On the other hand," he observes, "white children in New York who attend integrated schools are as prejudiced against Negroes as those who attend all-White schools."[2] (No specific reference is given.) In the Racial Isolation study, the very opposite was found: white students who had attended schools with Negroes for the longest time were less likely to prefer only white friends than white students who attended all-white schools.[3]

Putnam commented on at least two matters of interest. When challenged to explain the highest aspirations of Negro children, he replied: "Negroes have very high aspirations, often based on envy, but these are not matched by their perfromance. It is because of their high aspirational level that Negroes want the short cuts which they are unable to create themselves. The Jews, and many others, have found added motivation in hardship and persecution."[4] When asked to explain why bright Negro children whose I.Q. scores exceeded (overlapped) those of bright white children should not share the same classroom, Putnam answered:[1]

---

[1] Herbert Ravenel Sass, Mixed Schools and Mixed Blood (Jackson, Mississippi: Citizens Council, 1956), p.8.

[2] Charles C. Josey, An Inquiry Concerning Racial Prejudice (New York: International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, Inc., 1965), p.15.

[3] Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II, pp. 47 and 140, table 8, 9; see, also, Equal Educational Opportunity, p. 333, table

[4] Carleton Putnam, Race and Reality. A Search for Solutions (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1967) p. 115.

> ... Educability is a matter of more than I.Q. and overlap in I.Q. does not necessarily mean overlap in other important factors.... There is no such thing as "overlap" except in a specific quality. Educability is the learning pattern of an individual taken in totality and is made up of hundreds of traits. Overlap in all of these traits would simply mean that a child was not a Negro.

This conclusion is surely the *reductio ad absurdum* of racism.

9. CONCLUSIONS

The racial critique of desegregation is supported by a superficial interpretation of I.Q. score differentials by Shuey. Prominent in the critique is a stated concern for the mental health and self-coherence of the Negro child; basic to this view is an unsupported assumption that segregation is beneficial to the Negro child. Discredited allegations are

desegregation in the past. In general, there is a shocking disregard and ignorance of research results. Intellectual inquiry and reasoned debate can scarcely proceed under such circumstances.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 122.

CHAPTER 10

SUMMARY

Stated summarily, the major effects of school desegregation are as follows:

1. Academic achievement rises as the minority child learns more while the advantaged majority child continues to learn at his accustomed rate. Thus, the achievement gap narrows.

This finding is, for all practical purposes, established in relation to Negro children. It is less firm with regard to Indian Americans and Mexican-American children.

2. Negro aspirations, already high, are positively affected; self-esteem rises; and self-acceptance as a Negro grows.

With some exceptions, this is firmly established for Negro children; indicated for Mexican-American children; and true in an indeterminate degree for Indian American children.

3. Toleration, respect, and occasional friendships are the chief characteristics of student and teacher relations in the desegregated school. Little informal socializing occurs outside school.

Exceptions are numerous, with physical violence playing a diminishing role.

4. While culturally different from the Negro American, the Indian Americans and Mexican-Americans do not seem to respond to desegregation in any culturally unique ways.
5. The United States Office of Education Equal Educational Opportunity Study and the United States Commission on Civil Rights Racial Isolation Study lend strong support to the learning and attitudinal effects of desegregation.

The latter study affords the stronger support but in no sense can the former be properly interpreted in the contrary direction.

6. The effects of desegregation on Negro Americans are evident; the support the Negro community lends to desegregation is widespread.

The movement toward black nationalism has thus far, at least, not produced a mass disillusionment with the value of desegregation.

7. Virtually none of the negative predictions by anti-desegregationists finds support in studies of actual desegregation.

The rejected predictions concerned lower achievement, aggravated self-concepts of Negro children, and growing disorder in desegregated schools.

The findings of desegregation research have not been widely circulated. Even some social scientists are not acquainted with the research. Recently, for example, a leading scholarly journal printed two seriously erroneous statements about research findings:[1]

> ... Practically all the studies of the achievement of Negro pupils who have been placed in
> ment of Negro pupils who have been placed in
> "integrated" school environments, through busing programs or school pairings, have shown, at best, insignificant results. In many cases, desegregation has been associated with a decline in the performance of Negro pupils involved.

As material in Chapter 2, above, indicate, these two statements are contradicted by research.

RESEARCH TRENDS

Several possible research trends may be indicated.

---

[1] American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, October, 1967, p. 851.

1. The scope of desegregation research will expand to deal more adequately with the Indian American and Spanish-surname Americans.
2. The units of research analysis will be both smaller and larger: (a) the classroom rather than the school will be studied; and (b) the school system rather than the individual school will be analyzed.
3. More universities will engage in desegregation research as desegregation becomes socially acceptable.
4. School boards will become more research-permissive, if not research-minded, in response to increasing government requirements to demonstrate results.
5. In part because of a research emphasis on the classroom, desegregation will be more closely linked with pedagogical and instructional improvements.
6. Comparative perspectives will be employed increasingly as American desegregation problems are compared with foreign orientations to overcoming segregation and disadvantage.
7. Desegregation research will become more relevant to school practice as it is utilized by courts and administrative bodies to direct changes in educational procedures.
8. Federal executive agencies will encourage desegregation research by: (a) gathering nationwide benchmark statistics on racial aspects of schooling, and (b) expending more funds for research projects.
9. Congress will tend to be more receptive to desegregation research as research outcomes demonstrate the interdependence of educational improvement and desegregation.
10. Sociological and psychological perspectives will grow in importance in educational research to

the mutual benefit of all the scholarly fields concerned.

CONCLUSIONS

During the past few years, research on desegregation and related topics has expanded appreciably. Most of the formal studies of actual desegregation are university dissertation projects. During 1967-1969, such research has started to emerge from every major geographical area; and one cannot tell the region by the study's conclusions. Although welcome, often these studies suffer from two main shortcomings: (1) their restricted scope--one or two schools or several classrooms; (2) their meager method--frequently, the recording of differential mean scores between experimental and control groups is seen as the sole research problem.

In the future, the scope of desegregation studies might be broadened by organizing a school-system-wide analysis. Only collective research efforts could carry through such projects. The Riverside School Study comes to mind as a prototype. The method of desegregation studies urgently needs to be deepened and broadened. Research designs must include the exploration of the dynamics of the interracial classroom. This should include not only the social-psychological dimension but curricular and instructional adaptations. This can scarcely be accomplished without the investigator becoming deeply involved in the travails of daily classroom existence.

Many studies are written in a vacuum. In a study of a pairing of schools in New York City, the customary pre- and post-test mean scores are compared, with the Negro children attending the paired schools achieving significantly more in only one of several substantive areas. What the researcher did not reveal in the formal report was the living context of the study. Press reports told of intense community conflict over the course of the pairing, ability grouping separating the racial groups, lack of special preparation of teachers, and problems of administrative competence.[1] When the possible bearing of all this is taken into account, the modest accomplishment of the specific pairing experience takes on a different appearance.

Extremely few studies attempt to assess the role of the school and the school system in desegregation.[2] Creating a climate of change would seem to be such a role. A whole range of procedures and devices is within the administrative purview. Whether or not teachers see desegregation as an educational challenge with implications for their own traditional classroom approaches surely has a bearing on desegregation outcome. Desegregation is, for many children, a step toward individuation. Thus, guidance and counseling grow in importance. These, too, should enter into the evaluation of desegregation efforts.

As any reader of this book knows, many of the research findings are contradictory and puzzling. Little in existing basic social and psychological research is very helpful in creating a more meaningful synthesis. Indeed, many social science concepts are found to be of limited applicability to the present problems.

For example, much of the theorizing and concrete research on self-concept and aspirations has been found to apply much more readily to white middle class children than to poor children, black or white. Social stratification research has shed extremely little helpful light on the role of social class in the Negro community. It is a considerable mistake to think that social scientists have a reservoir of concepts and theories to account for the social reality of race and schools.[1] The reverse is probably true: A very rich reality awaits the attention of social scientists.

---

[1] See Felix Kessler, "Integration Misfire," Wall Street Journal, October 12, 1966 and letter by Mrs. Eric Salzman, New York World-Journal-Tribune, October 14, 1966.

[2] See Robert E. Herriott and Benjamin J. Hodgkins, Sociocultural Context and the American School: An Open-Systems Analysis of Educational Opportunity, January 1969, p. 242 (ERIC # ED 028502).

The relationship between education and integration bears far more explication than it has thus far received. A disjunction between the two is often assumed by both partisans of and antagonists to integration. Nothing in the research evidence supports such a view. Eliminating the bonds of racial discrimination by itself helps create the framework of a better education. But this should not become an argument on behalf of planlessness. Specific instructional strategies--and this is what many people regard as "education"--must accompany an integration plan. This is the practical purpose of integration.

School desegregation is, of course, part of a movement for equal educational opportunity. This concept, as indicated in Chapter I, above, is understood here as comprising the right of access and the right to achieve. Clearly, either one may be attained alone: All children could attend schools but learn little. Or, few might attend but learn little. Or, few might attend and achieve much. The problem today is to work out universal access along with general quality.

Herriott and Hodgkins say:[2]

> ... What we are seeing today in the schools of our central cities are the manifestations of a conflict between the requirements of a modern society for appropriately trained manpower and the desires of many individuals for greater social justice through the equalization of educational opportunity. These two forces are in conflict because they are based upon competing priorities.

---

[1] For further remarks on research needs, see especially, Katz and Gurin eds. Race and the Social Sciences, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1962.

[2] Herriott and Hodgkins, Sociocultural Context and the American School, p. 277.

The economy requires specialists and manages to influence the educational structure of the country to accommodate to this need. Much public money is used to train middle class children to become the specialists; their schools are relatively well-financed. But, note Herriott and Hodgkins, lower-class youth and their schools do not serve the larger economic need because their services are not required. Those who would universalize educational access must reckon with the resistance of a society which tends to value highest that need which seems most "realistic." Viewed from such a perspective, the strivings of minority youth are likely to appear the most unrealistic.

Sussman has declared:[1]

> Inequality of access may be waning, only to be replaced by differential chances to get a high quality education, which in its way is just as significant. While the educational level of the whole population has risen, the educational gap between the social classes, especially if measured by amount learned rather than years of schooling, may be as wide as ever.

More succinctly: "Unequal access to high school and university is replaced by unequal access to schooling of high quality."[2]

The movement against school segregation is an effort to end the growing separation of access from quality. If a new social segregation succeeds the old racial segregation, inequality of educational opportunity will grow.[3]

---

1. Leila Sussman, "Democratization and Class Segregation in Puerto Rican Schooling: The U. S. Model Transplanted," Sociology of Education, 41 (1968) 323.

2. Ibid., p. 335.

3. See George Mayeske, Teacher Attributes and School Achievement, paper presented at a U. S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education Professions Development Symposium, "How Do Teachers Make a Difference?" February 12, 1970, p. 20.

The future of desegregation research depends, in large measure, on the future of desegregation. This may become clearer by a glance backwards. Dunbar writes:[1]

> For Americans of a generation or even a decade ago to think clearly about the Negro problem was quite impossible. I cannot recall a single commentator, no matter how gifted, who had the understanding which we have today. This is not due to our intellectual merits, but to the fact that the Negro revolt has bridged over a mass of mental sets which we could not penetrate by thought.

So, too, it is likely that the present generation has much to learn about the potential and the implementation of equal opportunity. We will learn something from events. The great danger is that old mental sets may overwhelm us. The color line is like a noose lying loosely around the neck of democratic reform. If we do not tear it away, it will tighten. In that case, all hope for educational reform will cease.

---

[1] Leslie W. Dunbar, A Republic of Equals (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966), pp. 6-7.

AUTHOR INDEX

Aberle, Sophie D. 248
Abrahams, Paul 193
Agger, Robert E. 314, 339
Alam, Bilquis A. 111
Albert, Irene 284
Allen, Donald E. 116
Allen, Irving L. 323, 324-325
Allen, Vernon L. 149
Alsop, Joseph 284
Amarel, Marianne 179-180
Amerman, Helen E. 338
Ames, Nancy 179-180
Amos, Robert T. 205
Anderson, James G. 240, 241
Anderson, Kenneth E. 263, 271-272
Anderson, Louis V. 58, 214
Anderson, Simms, II 192
Applebaum, Adrian P. 70
Arendt, Hannah 369-373
Armstrong, Clairette P. 360-363, 366
Asher, Steven R. 149
Aurbach, Herbert A. 250
Ausubel, David P. 90
Ausubel, Pearl 90
Badal, Alden W. 44-47
Baehr, Rufus F. 124
Banks, George 211
Banks, Ronald 81, 182-183
Barry, E. Raymond 230
Bartee, Geraldine M. 133
Bartel, Nettie Rose 207
Barz, Anita I. 141-142
Bashshur, Rashid L. 110-111, 315-316
Bayton, James A. 147-148
Beardwood, Roger 327
Beaton, Albert E., Jr. 285, 288, 292

Beattie, Muriel 119
Beckham, Albert Sidney 208
Bedell, Frederick D. 68-70
Beecher, Robert H. 184
Beker, Jerome 61-62
Bennett, William S. 100-101
Bereiter, Carl 16
Berenson, Bernard G. 211
Berke, Melvyn A. 147
Berkowitz, Morris I. 44, 219
Berlin, Charles I. 27-28
Berlin, I.N. 162
Bienvienu, Millard J., Sr. 129, 186
Bierbryer, Bruce 26
Bindman, Aaron 39-40, 98-99, 166, 197-198
Binkley, M.E. 133
Birch, Herbert G. 275-276
Black, Harvey 19
Black, Isabella 348
Blackman, Leonard S. 208
Blake, Elias, Jr. 93-95, 97, 121, 137, 174, 201-202, 298
Blumenfeld, Ruth 313
Blumenthal, David 284
Bond, Horace Mann 154
Boney, J. Don 200
Boone, W.H. 158
Borowitz, Gene H. 15
Bowerman, Charles E. 106-107
Bowles, Samuel 284, 286, 287, 289, 290, 303
Bowman, Orrin H. 81
Boyd, G. F. 91
Bradley, Gladyce H. 166
Bradley, Nolen E., Jr. 171
Brant, C.S. 243-245
Bredemeier, Harry C. 13
Briggs, Delores G. 191
Brimmer, Andrew F. 108

Brink, William 325-326, 343
Brophy, William A. 248
Brown, Bert R. 26, 35, 140-141, 142
Brown, George E., Jr. 261
Brown, Robert G. 103
Brussell, Charles B. 239
Bryant, James C. 72-73, 186
Bryde, John F. 245-248
Buchanan, O. Lee 207
Bullough, Bonnie L. 346-347
Burkhead, Jesse 189
Burkheimer, G.J. 192
Burnes, Donna K. S. 24
Busse, Thomas V. 15, 136
Caffrey, Bernard 192
Caldron, Judith Batista Y 252-253
Campbell, Ernest Q. 106-107, 285, ch. 7
Canavan, Donna 233
Caplin, Morris D. 115, 134-135
Cardwell, John 180
Carkhuff, Robert R. 21
Carlson, Jerry S. 23.2
Carpenter, Thomas R. 136
Carwise, Joseph L. 113
Chandler, John T. 265-266
Chansky, Norman A. 210
Chesler, Mark A. 109, 173-176, 199-200, 201, 202, 203, 213, 214, 317-318. 371
Choldin, Harvey M. 341-342, 344, 345
Clark, Donald H. 21
Clark, Edward T. 141-142
Clark, Kenneth B. 38-143-145, 148, 151, 163
Clark, Mamie P. 143-145, 148, 151
Claye, Clifton M. 120-121, 160
Cohen, David K. 302
Cohen, Rosalie 25
Cohen, Wallace M. 292
Cole, Spurgeon 182, 192
Coleman, James S. 3, 89, 124, ch. 7, 284, 288, 341

Coles, Robert 127, 213, 371, 372
Colfax, J. David 323, 324-325
Collister, E. Gordon 240, 241
Coombs, L. Madison 241
Cooperman, Dan 369
Coopersmith, Stanley 154
Corey, John 42, 197, 226
Cornelius, John S. 251-252
Cowan, Gloria 106
Cox, Oliver C. 154
Crain, Robert L. 307, 311, 316
Cramer, M. Richard 106
Criswell, Joan H. 157-158
Crowley, Mary R. 37
Curtis, Bryon W. 117
Datta, Lois-ellin 206
Davidson, Helen H. 14
Davis, Hadassah 144-145, 178
Davis, Malcolm 206
Davis, O. L., Jr. 264-265
DeBerry, Clyde 314, 339
Decker, A.I. 36
DeHoyos, Arture 252, 253-254
Denmark, Florence L. 75-76, 210
Dennis, Wayne 147
Dentler, Robert A 59, 284
Derbyshire, Robert L. 123-124, 266-267
DeReuck, Anthony 1
Deutsch, Martin 26, 35
DeVos, George 1
Diamant, Louis 149-150
Diaz-Mora, Nelson 265
Dill, Anne C. 27-28
Dilling, H. J. 243
DiPasquale, Mary Ellen 81, 182-183
Dole, Arthur A. 22
Donovan, Bernard E. 86
Dreger, Ralph M. 219
DuBois, W. E. B. 119

Dunbar, Leslie W. 385
Dunmore, Charlotte J. 216
Dunn, Theodore F. 159
Durig, Kurt R. 113-114
Duster, Troy 229
Dwyer, Robert J. 160
Dyer, Henry S. 284
Eagle, Norman 26
Edington, Everett D. 273
Edwards, C. Drew 150
Edwards, T. Bentley 205
Elinson, Jack 343
Elliott, Merle H. 44-47
Ellis, Desmond P. 208
Elshorst, Hanjorg 164
Entwisle, Doris R. 16
Epps, Edgar G. 130, 187
Erenberg, Phyllis 213
Erikson, Erik H. 155-156
Escoffery, Aubrey S. 132-133
Evans, Idella M. 270-271
Fanon, Frantz 249
Farlee, Coralie 13
Farmer, William A. 251
Feagin, Joe R. 341, 342, 343, 344
Ferguson, Harold A. 32
Fichter, Joseph H. 107-109, 296
Fiddmont, Norman S. 190
Fifer, Gordon 21
Flory, Stanley E. 110-111, 314-315
Folger, John K. 239, 343
Forbes, Gordon B. 193
Forbes, Jack D. 250
Fortenberry, James H. 49-50
Foster, Charles H. 369
Fox, David J. 86
Fox, Thomas G. 289
Franks, Bonita B. 13, 111
Franseth, Jane 364

Frenkel, Sinai I.	139
Frisch, Fiora R.	147
Gabler, Robert	133-134
Galvan, Robert T.	263-264
Garrett, Henry E.	352, 353-360, 375
Garrison, Janet	192
Garth, Charles E.	140-214
Garth, Thomas R.	11
Geiger, Odis G.	73
Geisel, Paul N.	97-99, 101, 121, 282
Geisler, John S.	80
Gell, Cyrille	343
Gentry, Harold W.	187-188
Georgeoff, Peter J.	135
Gerard, Harold B.	230, 236, 237
Gibby, Robert G. Sr.	133-134
Gilbert, Neil	40
Gilliland, Burt E.	198
Gipson, Marilyn	193
Gist, Noel P.	100-101
Gitter, A. George	19
Goff, Regina M.	91-92
Goldberg, Faye J.	106
Goldberg, Herman R.	81, 82
Goldblatt, Harold S.	99
Goldin, Paul C.	213
Goldner, Norman S.	252-253
Goldstein, Bernard	13
Gomez, Anna N.	273
Goodman, Mary E.	145
Gordon, Edmund W.	204, 284, 286, 287, 302, 337
Gordon, John E., Jr.	212
Gordon, Leonard	168-170, 358
Goslin, David A.	220
Gottlieb, David	101-103, 195-197, 200
Graves, Marian F.	68-70
Green, James A.	230-234
Green, Russell F.	81
Greenberg, Judith W.	14

Greenberg, Norman C. 243
Greenberger, Ellen 16
Greenfield, Meg 284
Greenwald, Herbert J. 148-149
Gregor, A. James 146, 360, 366-369
Gregory, Karl D. 111
Grier, Eunice S. 92
Griffen, Joyce 245
Griffith, John H. 81
Gross, Neal 340
Guerra, Manuel H. 268
Guggenheim, Fred 134, 154
Gunthorpe, Muriel B. 53-54, 358
Gurin, Gerald 119
Gurin, Patricia 117-118, 119, 383
Guskin, Judith 213
Guttentag, Marcia 75-76, 210
Haberman, Paul W. 343
Haddon, John 210
Hader, R. J. 193
Haggstrom, Warren C. 121-123, 137, 161, 174
Hall, Morrill M. 187-188
Hallowell, A. Irving 226
Halsey, Margaret 369
Hamlin, Herbert M. 98
Hammond, Alpha J. 83
Handler, June M. 172
Handler, Leonard 147
Hansen, Carl F. 43
Hardt, Robert H. 80, 186
Hargrave, Edythe 158
Harootunian, Berj 128, 186
Harris, Albert J. 34
Harris, Anna S. 26
Harris, Gary R. 14, 207
Harris, Louis 325-326, 343
Harris, Yeuell Y. 22
Harwood, Edwin S. 345
Heath, Robert W. 195

Heller, Celia	255-258
Helton, William C.	206
Henderson, Edmund H.	139-140
Henderson, George	113
Henderson, Vivian W.	98
Hendrick, Irving	229
Herriott, Robert E.	92-93, 163, 216, 382, 383-384
Hertzig, Margaret E.	275-276, 277
Hewitt, Robert R.	230
Hickerson, Nathaniel	229
Hicks, Leo G., Sr.	212
Hicks, Robert A.	353
Hildebrandt, Charles A.	178-179
Hillson, Henry T.	44
Hippler, Arthur E.	12
Hirsch, Jay G.	15
Hobart, C.W.	243-245
Hobson, Carol J.	279
Hodgkins, Benjamin	130, 382, 383-384
Hofmann, Louis J.	26
Holland, Florence N.	368
Holland, John W.	289
Hollister, Clifton D.	340
Hook, Sidney	369
Hsia, Jayjia	80-81
Huber, William H.	272-273
Hunt, David E.	80, 186
Hunter, Charlayne	164-165
Huson, Carolyn F.	107
Hutchins, Edwin B.	113, 127, 130
Inger, Morton	60-61, 293
Jabonsky, Adlaide	302
Jackson, Anna Mae	18
Jackson, Ellen	85, 167-168
Jackson, Jonathan	213
Jacobson, Lenore F.	261-262
Janney, Fred	176
Jawa, Manmohan S.	80
Jencks, Christopher	284

Jensen, Arthur R. 375
Jerrems, Raymond L. 339
Jewell, Walter O., III 340
Johnson, Edward E. 147
Johnson, Harold T. 213
Johnson, Henry 255
Johnson, Norman J. 40, 41
Johnson, William H. 271-272
Jonsson, Harold A. 84-85, 142-143, 166-167
Josey, Charles C. 376
Kapel, David E. 360
Kaplan, Henry K. 172-173, 214
Katz, Daniel 117-118
Katz, Irwin 31, 47-48, 177, 200, 217-226, 282, 284, 286, 288, 302-303, 359, 389
Katzenmeyer, William G. 50-52, 349, 350-351, 358
Keller, Suzanne 91
Kennedy, Wallace A. 20, 33, 352-353, 354, 359
Kessler, Felix 382
Kidd, J. Roby 244
Kimball, William L. 267
Kimbrough, Jackie 235
King, John R. 252
Kinnick, Bernard C. 213
Kirkpatrick, David 213
Klein, Robert S. 70-71
Kleinke, Chris 233
Knight, Julie 1
Knox, Ellis O. 355
Koslin, Bertham L. 180
Koslin, Sandra C. 179-180, 285
Koury, Rose 364
Kron, Ralph E. 241
Krystall, Eric R. 109, 317-318
Ladd, Carl E. 240
Ladner, Joyce Ann 11
Landers, Jacob 33, 290
Lange, Robert 271-272

Lao, Rosina C. 119
Lee, Frank F. 162
Lenkowsky, Ronald S. 208
Lesser, Gerald S. 21, 24, 52-53, 375
Lessing, Elise E. 129-130
Levin, Henry M. 284, 286, 287, 289, 290, 303
Levin, Joel R. 167
Levine, Daniel U. 190
Lewis, Howard E. 132
Lewis, Ralph G. 340
Lewis, Sinclair O. 211-212
Liebhafsky, E.E. 98
Lillienstein, Ernest 313-314
Lipton, Aaron 169, 364
Locke, Don W. 212
Lockwood, Jane D. 59-60, 141, 198
Logan, Rayford W. 90
Lombardi, Donald N. 159
Long, Barbara H. 139-140
Long, David 73-74
Long, Howard H. 35
Lovelady, Bert E. 11
Lovinger, Robert J. 34
Lund, S. E. Torsten 210
Lusienski, Dean R. 165
Luszki, Margaret B. 214
Mackler, Bernard 17
MacMillan, Robert W. 262-263
Maddox, James G. 98
Mahan, Aline M. 78
Mahan, Thomas W. 78
Maliver, Bruce L. 123
Malkin, Edward E. 369
Mallory, Sharon 176
Malry, Lenton 268
Marascuilo, Leonard A. 285
Markley, Oliver W. 193
Marx, Gary T. 153, 314-315, 318

Matkom, Anthony J. 172-173, 214
Matthiasson, Carolyn W. 268-269
Matzen, Stanley P. 55-58
Mayeske, George W. 268, 285, 288, 292, 384
Mayo, Clara 85, 167-168
Mayo, Marion J. 36
McDill, Edward L. 183-217
McDill, Mary S. 62-65, 183
McDonogh, Edward C. 270
McDowell, Sophie F. 189-191
McGlamery, C. Donald 192
McGurk, F. C. J. 354
McKlissick, Floyd 285
McLaughlin, John A. 210
McPartland, James 65-68, 279, 293-294, 295, 296, 298-299, 365
McPherson, D. Angus 146
McWhirt, Ronald A. 127, 186
McWorter, Gerald A. 313-314
Meeks, Donald E. 103-104
Meier, Deborah 285
Meketon, Betty F. 124-127, 137, 213, 281, 298, 371
Mendez, Olga Aran 275-277
Mercer, Jane R. 236
Merrifield, Phil 255
Meyers, Edmund D., Jr. 188-189, 217
Meyers, Edna O. 12, 13, 214-215
Milgram, Norman A. 25
Miller, Charles K. 210
Miller, Harold J. 249-250
Miller, Harr L. 212
Miller, Kent S. 219
Miller, La Mar 127-128
Miller, Norman 230, 234
Mock, Ronald L. 176
Mommsen, Kent G. 116
Monroe, Charles 43
Mood, Alexander M. 279, 285

Moore, William J., Jr. 339, 341, 342, 344, 345
Moorefield, Thomas E. 82-83, 183-184
Morland, J. Kenneth 43, 150-152, 191
Morse, Richard J. 128, 186
Muir, Donald E. 192
Muldrow, Tressie W. 147-148
Muste, A. J. 371
Muzlekari, Louis H. 25
Myers, Florence C. 44
Nalven, Frederic B. 26
Nam, Charles B. 92-93, 239, 343
Nash, Kermit 212
Newbrough, J. R. 25-26
Newby, I. A. 348
Nichols, Robert C. 285, 287, 303
Noel, Donald L. 152-153
North, George E. 207
Norton, Daniel P. 80-81
O'Connor, Andrew L., III 177-178
Odell, William R. 105-106
Olexa, Carol 210
Olmsted, Patricia 16
Oppenheim, Don B. 148-149
O'Reilly, Robert P. 7, 219
Osborne, R. Travis 354, 374-375
Ozenhosky, Richard J. 141-142
Ozer, Mark N. 25
Pajonas, Patricia J. 219
Pancoast, Elinor 200
Parelius, Robert, Jr. 15
Pargament, Richard 180
Parsons, Theodore, W., Jr. 258-261
Passow, A. Harry 319-320, 339, 355
Pederson, Eigil D. 340
Peele, Stanton 112
Pellegrini, Robert J. 353
Penalosa, Fernando 270
Personke, Carl R., Jr. 264-265

Pettigrew, Thomas F. 48, 90, 200, 219, 226-227, 229, 285, 286, 293, 295, 303, 304, 311-312, 317
Pfankuch, Marjorie B. 52-53
Pfautz, Harold W. 285, 286, 287
Phillips, William M., Jr. 13
Pierce, Chester M. 193-194
Plakos, John 265-266
Platoff, Joan C. 216
Platter, Stanton D. 213
Plaut, Richard L. 32
Plotkin, Lawrence 38, 163
Polk, Kenneth 300
Polkoff, Sally E. 52-53
Posner, Carmen A. 135
Potter, E. Bruce 272-273
Powell, Alice M. 145-146
Powell, Christus 99-100
Pratt, Philip S. 251
Prichard, Paul N. 76, 216-217
Proshek, John M. 292
Pugh, Nathaniel 213
Pugh, Roderick W. 181-182
Purl, Mabel C. 231, 232, 233, 236
Putnam, Carleton 376-377
Radin, Norma 58-59
Radke, Marion J. 145-146, 178
Raven, Bertram H. 237
Record, Wilson 213
Redfearn, David 235
Rhodes, A. Lewis 92-93, 116
Richmond, Bert O. 19
Riese, Herta 226
Riessman, Frank 338
Rigsby, Leo C. 217
Riley, Robert 75-76, 210
Rivera, Ramon J. 313-314
Robinson, Oliver W. 116
Rodgers, Frederick A. 19

Rodman, Hyman 111-112
Rodriguez, Hernan 273-274
Rosenberg, Morris 215
Rosenberg, Pearl 178
Rosenblatt, Joan B. 270
Rosenfeld, Michael 74
Rosenhan, David L. 206-207, 211
Rosenthal, Kristine M. 52-53
Rosenthal, Robert 203
Rossitto, Richard 176
Roth, Rodney W. 180-181
Roy, Larnders 195
Rubel, Arthur J. 254-255
Ryan, Margaret W. 158-159
Ryckman, David B. 12
Ryne, Laura H. 369
Safar, Dwight 263
Sain, Leonard F. 104-105
Salzman, Eric (Mrs.) 382
Samuels, Ivan G. 48-49
Sartain, James A. 214
Sarthory, Joseph A. 271
Sass, Herbert Ravenel 375-376
Sawhill, Lucy M. 83
Schaefer, Earl 206
Schafer, Walter E. 210, 300
Schaffer, Albert 192
Schiltz, Michael E. 107
Schmadel, Elnora 255
Schmuck, Richard 214
Schneider, Frank W. 176-177
Schreiber, Daniel 34
Schroff, Ruth 251
Schwartz, Mildred A. 370
Scott, John C., Jr. 239-240
Scott, Ralph 34, 71-72
Seeley, David S. 1
Segal, Phyllis 173-176, 203, 214, 371
Sewell, William H. 285, 286, 287-288

Sexton, Patricia C. 289, 291
Shabat, Oscar E. 226
Shaffer, Ruth C. 192
Shannon, Gary W. 110, 314-315
Sheldon, Pamela 284
Shuey, Audrey M. 349-353, 377
Sigel, Irving E. 16
Simon, John 176
Simonian, Kenneth 22
Singer, Dorothy G. 136-138, 174, 281
Singer, Harry 230, 231, 237-238
Singh, Surendra, Pratap 17-18
Sitkei, Emil G. 24
Slone, Irene Wholl 74-75
Smith, D.B. 23
Smith, Hale W. 11
Smith, Ralph V. 110-111, 314-315, 338, 342
Smith, Ruth S. 22
Soares, Anthony T. 132
Soares, Louise M. 132
Solomon, Benjamin 209
Solomon, Daniel 15, 227
Spiegel, John P. 320
Spitz, David 369, 372
Spitzer, Murray 285
Sprehe, J. Timothy 183
Spruill, Albert W. 50
Stabler, John R. 146-147
Stakenas, Robert G. 130
Stallings, Frank H. 47-48
Steinberg, Jay 192
Stewart, Lawrence H. 22
Stinchcombe, Arthur S. 62-65
Stinson, Harold N. 123
St. John, Nancy H. 106, 163-164, 216, 219, 255
Stodolsky, Susan S. 21, 24, 375
Stoller, David S. 285
Stout, Robert 60-61, 293
Strayer, George D. 355

Sussman, Leila 384
Sutherland, Jean 178
Taba, Hilda 160, 255
Tabler, Kenneth A. 292
Tanser, Harry A. 351-352, 354
Taylor, Charlotte P. 133
Teele, James E. 85, 167-168
Tefft, Stanton K. 248-249
Ten Houten, Warren D. 189
Thomas, Alexander 275-277
Thomas, Cleveland A. 161-162
Thomas, W. I. 194
Thorndike, Robert L. 86
Thorpe, Claiburne B. 114-115
Trager, Helen G. 144-145, 178
Trent, Richard D. 120
Trillin, Calvin 164
Tripp, Delores 59
Tulkin, Steven R. 20, 25-26
Tumin, Melvin 369, 372, 373
Tyer, Harold L. 213
Tyson, Cyril 99
Ulibarri, Horacio 254
Vandenberg, Donald 364
Van den Haag, Ernest 363-366, 371
Van de Riet, V. 33
Vane, Julie R. 70
Vasquez, J. Anthony 273
Veblen, Thorstein 30
Veroff, Joseph 112
Vogel, Virgil J. 247
Vogler, James D. 265
Volkman, Jacob 11
Vontress, Clement E. 211
Voydanoff, Patricia 111-112
Vredevoe, Lawrence E. 163
Walker, Dollie 62-65
Waxman, Harvey 180
Wayson, William W. 221, 339

7

Webster, Staten W. 160-161, 210, 213
Weddington, Rachel T. 119-120
Weinberg, Meyer 3, 47, 87, 219, 226, 355
Weinfeld, Frederic D. 279, 285, 288, 292
Weissman, Julius 274-275
Weitzman, Jonathan 70
Wendland, Marilyn M. 131-132
Werner, Emmy E. 22
Werner, Norma E. 270-271
Wessman, Alden E. 76-77, 130, 187
Wey, Herbert W. 42, 197, 226
White, Agatha E. 109, 317-318
White, James C. 33
Whiteman, Martin 26
Whitmore, Paul G., Jr. 179
Wiggins, James W. 208
Wilcox, Preston R. 205
Wiley, Alfred D. 43
Wilkerson, Doxey A. 204
Williams, Frank E. 75
Williams, Jay Reigle 27
Williams, John E. 150
Williams, Robert B. 83
Williams, Robert L. 182
Williams, Robin M., Jr. 158-159
Wilson, Alan B. 95-97, 285, 294-295, 297, 299-301, 358
Wilson, Kenneth M. 77-78
Winther, Sven F. 272-273
Wise, James H. 149
Wisler, Carl E. 292
Witty, Paul A. 36
Wolman, T.G. 54-55, 358
Wood, Bruce H. 78, 181
Woods, Dan 85
Wyer, Robert 40
Wylie, Ruth C. 113, 127, 130
Yasar, Erhan 233-234
York, Robert L. 279, 293-294, 295, 298-299

Zadny, Jerry	234
Zamoff, Richard B.	209
Zavalloni, Marisa	91
Zinberg, Norman E.	202

GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX TO AREAS STUDIED

Alabama 99-100, 107, 109, 139, 173-176, 191-192, 199-200, 203, 214,222
Alaska 239-240
Arizona 207, 240, 265, 270
Arkansas 120-121
California 12, 44-47, 55-58, 84-85, 95-97, 124, 142, 160-161, 162-163, 166-167, 176, 203-204, 210, 229-238, 251, 252, 255-262, 265-268, 270, 294-295, 296-297, 300-301
Colorado 18, 245, 251
Connecticut 78-79, 162, 181, 216
Delaware 50, 128, 133, 186, 281-282
District of Columbia 35, 42 92, 143-144, 147-148, 159, 189-191
Florida 18, 32, 75, 79-80, 103, 113, 117, 129, 176-178, 186
Georgia 19, 79, 164-165, 192
Hawaii 21-22
Illinois 12, 15, 16, 39-41, 80-81, 98-99, 113, 124, 129-130, 135, 161-162, 166, 193, 197-198, 208
Indiana 48-49, 114, 119-120, 135, 207
Iowa 71-72, 252
Kansas 36, 176
Kentucky 47, 50, 124-127, 140, 213, 214
Louisiana 107
Maryland 16, 17, 20, 23, 27, 62165, 123-124, 132-133, 166, 200, 201
Massachusetts 85, 90, 103-104, 150-151, 202
Michigan 16, 50-52, 58-59, 104-105, 110-111, 112, 121-123, 127-128, 158, 168-170, 180-181, 205, 223, 252-254, 350
Minnesota 252-253

Mississippi 79-80, 107
Missouri 11, 24, 82-83, 100-101, 183-184
New Jersey 13, 23, 115, 133-134, 149, 206-207
New Mexico 242, 268, 271, 272-273
New York 11, 12, 13, 17, 21, 32-33, 34, 35, 36, 44, 52-55, 59-60, 61-62, 68-70, 74-75, 75-76, 81-82, 83-84, 85-86, 99, 120, 134, 141, 143-144, 148-149, 154, 157-158, 169, 182-183, 184-185, 198, 210, 212, 215, 273-277
North Carolina 14, 19, 76, 91, 107, 114-115, 131, 132-133, 149-150, 208, 216-217
North Dakota 249-250
Ohio 37, 80, 178-179, 181-182, 193
Oklahoma 11, 49-50, 116, 139
Pennsylvania 13, 105-106, 111, 113, 144, 178
South Carolina 70-71, 73, 79-80, 127, 186, 192
South Dakota 245-246
Tennessee 32, 58, 79-80, 97-99, 133, 171, 179. 198-199, 206, 214
Texas 11, 32, 43, 72-73, 111, 133, 185-186. 254-255, 262-265, 271-272
Virginia 23, 107, 132-133, 149-150, 206
Washington 83
West Virginia 50
Wisconsin 193, 268-269
Wyoming 248-249

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Paul Abrahams, "Black Thursday at Oshkosh," Crisis, 76 (1969)

Bilquis A. Alam, Perception of Opportunity and Occupational Expectations: A Racial Comparison of Rural Youth, April, 1968 (ERIC # 021 663)

Irene Albert and Pamela Sheldon, "Equality of Educational Opportunity," Educational Leadership, December, 1966

Donald E. Allen and Oliver W. Robinson, Some Factors Affecting Academic Performance of Public Assistance Students, 1969 (ERIC #029 747)

Irving L. Allen and J. David Colfax, Urban Problems and Public Opinion in Four Connecticut Cities (Storrs, Connecticut: Institute of Urban Research, University of Connecticut, December, 1968)

Joseph Alsop, "Reaction to the Coleman Report," N. E. A. Journal, September, 1967

Helen E. Amerman, The Impact of Inter-Group Relations on Non-Segregated Urban Public Education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954)

Robert T. Amos, "The Accuracy of Negro and White Children's Predictions of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Negro Students," Journal of Negro Education, 21 (1952)

James G. Anderson, William H. Johnson, and Robert Lange, Mexican-American Students in a Metropolitan Context: Factors Affecting the Social-Emotional Climate of the Classroom, July, 1969 (ERIC # ED 030 521)

________ and Dwight Safar, "The Influence of Differential Community Perceptions on the Provision of Equal Educational Opportunities," Sociology of Education, 40 (1967)

Kenneth E. Anderson, E. Gordon Collister, and Carl E. Ladd, The Educational Achievement of Indian Children (Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1953)

Louis V. Anderson, *The Effects of Desegregation on the Achievement and Personality Patterns of Negro Children* (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 237)

Hannah Arendt, "A Reply to Critics," *Dissent,* Spring, 1959

________, "Reflections on Little Rock," *Dissent,* Winter, 1959

David Armor, *School and Family Effects on Black and White Achievement: A Re-examination of the USOE Data* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Department of Social Relations, Harvard University, June, 1969)

Clairette P. Armstrong, *Psychodiagnosis, Prognosis, School Desegregation and Delinquency* (New York: International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, n. d.), reprinted from *Mankind Quarterly,* October-December, 1964

________ and A. James Gregor, "Integrated Schools and Negro Character Development: Some Considerations of the Possible Effects," *Psychiatry,* February, 1964

Steven R. Asher and Vernon L. Allen, "Racial Preferences and Social Comparison Processes," *Journal of Social Issues,* 25 (1969)

Herbert A. Aurbach (ed.), Proceedings of the *National Research Conference on American Indian Education* (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Society for the Study of Social Problems, 1967)

David P. and Pearl Ausubel, "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children," in Harry A. Passow (ed.), *Education in Depressed Areas* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963)

Rufus F. Baehr, *Need Achievement and Dialect in Lower-Class Adolescent Negroes* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964)

________, "'Negro Dialect' and the Motive to Achieve," *Integrated Education,* February-March, 1966

George Banks, Bernard G. Berenson, and Robert R. Carkhuff, "The Effects of Counselor Race and Training Upon Counseling Process with Negro Clients in Initial Interviews," *Journal of Clinical Psychology,* 23 (1967)

Ronald Banks and Mary Ellen Di Pasquale, *A Study of the Educational Effectiveness of Integration* (Buffalo, New York: Buffalo Public Schools, January, 1969)

Ralph W. Barber, *The Effects of Open Enrollment on Anti-Negro and Anti-White Prejudices Among Junior High School Students in Rochester, New York* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1968)

E. Raymond Barry, Robert R. Hewitt, Harold B. Gerard, Norman Miller, and Harry Singer, *Factors Contributing to Adjustment and Achievement in Racially Desegregated Public Schools* (Riverside, California: Riverside Unified School District, August, 1966)

Nettie Rose Bartel, *Locus of Control and Achievement in Middle Class and Lower Class Children* (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-4725)

Geraldine McMurry Bartee, *The Perceptual Characteristics of Disadvantaged Negro and Caucasian College Students* (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-1128)

James A. Bayton and Tressie W. Muldrow, "Interacting Variables in the Perception of Racial Personality Traits," *Journal of Research in Personality,* 3 (1968)

Roger Beardwood, "The New Negro Mood," *Fortune,* January 1968

Albert Sidney Beckham, "A Study of Race Attitudes in Negro Children of Adolescent Age," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* 29 (1934-1935)

Robert Houston Beecher, *A Study of Social Distance Among Adolescents of Ethnic Minorities* (Doctoral dissertation New York University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 780)

Jerome Beker, *A Study of Integration in Racially Imbalanced Urban Public Schools. A Demonstration and Evaluation. Final Report* (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Youth Development Center, May, 1967)

Carl Bereiter, "A Nonpsychological Approach to Early Compensatory Education," in *Social Class, Race and Psychological Development,* edited by Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz, and Arthur R. Jensen (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968)

Morris I. Berkowitz, *Studies of School Desegregation and Achievement. A Summary* (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Commission on Human Relations, May, 1967)

Charles I. Berlin and Anne C. Dill, "The Effect of Feedback and Positive Reinforcement on the Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test Scores of Lower-Class Negro and White Children," *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research,* 10 (1967)

I. N. Berlin, "Desegregation Creates Problems, Too," *Saturday Review,* June 15, 1963

Millard J. Bienvenu, Sr., *Effects of School Integration on the Self-Concept and Anxiety of Lower-Class, Negro Adolescent Males* (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 671)

Aaron Bindman, *Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 65-7076)

________, "Pre-College Preparation of Negro College Students," *Journal of Negro Education,* Fall, 1966

M. E. Binkley, *First Grade Entrance Variables Related to Achievement and Personality* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15, 773)

"Black and White at Northwestern University," *Integrated Education,* 6 (1968)

Isabella Black, "Race and Unreason: Anti-Negro Opinion in Professional and Scientific Literature Since 1954," *Phylon,* Spring, 1965

Elias Blake, Jr., *A Comparison of Intraracial and Inter-racial Levels of Aspiration* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1960) (University Microfilms Order No. 60-1616)

________, *A Re-Definition of Educational Problems Occasioned* *by Desegregation and Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,* unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967

Ruth Blumenfeld, *Children of Integration* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-251)

David Blumenthal, "Coleman Report Brings Revolution, No Solutions," *Harvard Crimson,* November 28, 1967

Horace Mann Bond, "Self-Respect as a Factor in Racial Advancement," *Annals,* 140 (1928)

J. Don Boney, "Some Dynamics of Disadvantaged Students in Learning Situations," *Journal of Negro Education,* Summer, 1967

W. H. Boone, "Problems of Adjustment of Negro Students at a White School," *Journal of Negro Education,* October, 1942

Gene H. Borowitz and Jay G. Hirsch, *A Developmental Typology of Disadvantaged Four-Year-Olds* (Chicago: Institute for Juvenile Research, March 21, 1968)

Samuel Bowles and Henry M. Levin, *Equality of Educational Opportunity--A Critical Appraisal,* 1967

G. F. Boyd, "The Levels of Aspiration of White and Negro Children in a Non-Segregated Elementary School," *Journal of Social Psychology,* XXXVI, 1952

Gladyce H. Bradley, "Friendships Among Students in Desegregated Schools," *Journal of Negro Education,* Winter, 1964

Nolen E. Bradley, Jr., *The Negro Undergraduate Student: Factors Relative to Performance in Predominantly White State Colleges and Universities in Tennessee* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-12, 606)

C. S. Brant and C. W. Hobart, "Sociocultural Conditions and Consequences of Native Education in the Arctic: A Cross-National Comparison," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, November 17-21, 1965

Delores Griffin Briggs, *Deviations from Standard English in Papers of Selected Alabama Negro High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama,

1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-6528)

Andrew F. Brimmer, "Education and the Economic Advancement of Minority Groups," *Integrated Education,* March-April, 1970

________, "Employment Patterns, and the Dilemma of Desegregation," *Integrated Education,* October-November, 1967

William Brink and Louis Harris, *Black and White* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967)

________, *The Negro Revolution in America* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1964)

William A. Brophy and Sophie D. Aberle (compilers), "Education," chapter 5 in *The Indian. America's Unfinished Business* (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966)

Bert R. Brown, *The Assessment of Self-Concept Among Four-Year-Old Negro and White Children: A Comparative Study Using the Brown-IDS Self-Concept Reference Test* (New York: Institute for Developmental Studies, New York University, 1966)

Robert G. Brown, "A Comparison of the Vocational Aspirations of Paired Sixth-Grade White and Negro Children Who Attend Segregated Schools," *Journal of Educational Research,* May-June, 1965

Charles B. Brussell, *Disadvantaged Mexican-American Children and Early Educational Experience,* 1968 (ERIC # ED 030 517)

James Chester Bryant, *Some Effects of Racial Integration of High School Students on Standardized Achievement Test Scores, Teacher Grades and Dropout Rates in Angleton, Texas* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-768)

John F. Bryde, "A New Approach to Indian Education," *Integrated Education,* 6 (1968) 29-36

________, *The Sioux Indian Student: A Study of Scholastic Failure and Personality Conflict* (Pine Ridge, South Dakota 57770: Holy Rosary Mission, 1966)

Bonnie Louise Bullough, *Alienation Among Middle Class Negroes: Social-Psychological Factors Influencing*

Housing Desegregation (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968) University Microfilms Order No. 68-16, 517

________, "Alienation in the Ghetto," *American Journal of Sociology,* 72 (1966-1967)

Jesse Burkhead with Thomas G. Fox and John W. Holland, *Input and Output in Large-City High Schools* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1967)

Donna Key Standley Burnes, *A Study of Relationships Between Measured Intelligence and Non-Intellective Factors for Children of Two Socio-economic Groups and Races* (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-8989)

Bernard Caffrey, Simms Anderson II, and Janet Garrison, "Change in Racial Attitudes of White Southerners After Exposure to the Atmosphere of a Southern University," *Psychological Reports,* 25 (1969)

Judith Batista Y Calderon, *A Study of Counter-Prejudice in a Mexican-Spanish Community in the Surroundings of Des Moines* (Master's thesis, Drake University, 1948)

California State Department of Education, *Racial and Ethnic Survey of California Public Schools, Part One: Distribution of Pupils, Fall, 1966* (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, March, 1967)

Donna Canavan, *Field Dependence in Children as a Function of Grade, Sex, and Ethnic Group Membership,* paper read at American Psychological Association, September, 1969

Morris Daniel Caplin, "The Relationship between Self-Concept and Academic Achievement," *Journal of Experimental Education,* 37 (1969)

________, "*The Relationship Between Self-Concept and Academic Achievement and Between Level of Aspiration and Academic Achievement* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-10, 284)

________, "Self-Concept, Level of Aspiration, and Academic Achievement," *Journal of Negro Education,* Fall, 1968

Thomas R. Carpenter and Thomas V. Busse, "Development of

Self-Concept in Negro and White Welfare Children," *Child Development,* 40 (1969)

Joseph L. Carwise, *Aspirations and Attitudes Toward Education of Over- and Under-Achieving Junior High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-4711)

Center for Urban Education, "A Special Enrichment Program of Quality Integrated Education for Schools in Transitional Areas," in Donovan, *Summary of Proposed Programs,* below.

________, "Grade Reorganization Preparatory to the Establishment of the Comprehensive High School," July 31, 1967 (typewritten draft)

John T. Chandler and John Plakos, "Spanish-Speaking Pupils Classified as Educable Mentally Retarded," *Integrated Education,* 7 (1969)

Mark A. Chesler, "Interaction and Teaching Alternatives in Desegregated Classrooms," in Robert Lee Green (ed.) *Racial Crisis in American Education* (Chicago: Follett, 1969)

________ and Phyllis Segal, *Characteristics of Negro Students Attending Previously All-White Schools in the Deep South* (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, September, 1967)

________, Judith Guskin, and Phyllis Erenberg, Planning Educational Change, Vol. II: *Human Resources in School Desegregation* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1969)

________, *Teacher Training Designs for Improving Instruction in Interracial Classrooms,* unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-17, 1967

Harvey M. Choldin, *First Year in the Metropolis: A Study of Migration and Adjustment* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965)

Edward T. Clark, Richard J. Ozenhosky, Anita I. Barz, and John V. O'Leary, "Self-Concept and Vocabulary Development in Negro and White Pre-School Children," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, April, 1967

Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie P. Clark, "Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children," *Journal of Negro Education*, 19 (1950)

________ and ________, "Segregation as a Factor in the Racial Identification of Negro Pre-School Children; A Preliminary Report," *Journal of Experimental Education*, 8 (1939-1940)

________ and ________, "Skin Color as a Factor in Racial Identification of Negro Pre-School Children," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 11 (1940)

________ and ________, "The Development of Consciousness of Self and the Emergence of Racial Identification in Negro Pre-School Children," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10 (1939)

________ and Lawrence Plotkin, *The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges* (New York: National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1963)

Clifton M. Claye, *A Study of the Relationship Between Self-Concepts and Attitudes Toward the Negro Among Secondary School Pupils in Three Schools of Arkansas* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1958)

David K. Cohen, "Policy for the Public Schools," *Harvard Educational Review*, Winter, 1968

Rosalie Cohen, "The Relation between Socio-conceptual Styles and Orientation to School Requirements," *Sociology of Education*, 41 (1968)

Spurgeon Cole, Jay Steinberg, and G. J. Burkheimer, "Prejudice and Conservatism in a Recently Integrated Southern College," *Psychological Reports* 23 (1968)

James S. Coleman, "Equal Schools or Equal Students?" *Public Interest*, Summer, 1966

________, *Race Relations and Social Change* (Baltimore, Maryland: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, July, 1967)

________, *The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity*, paper read at a conference at the Harvard University Graduate School of Education, October 21, 1967

———, Ernest Q. Campbell, Carol J. Hobson, James McPartland, Alexander M. Mood, Frederic D. Weinfeld, and Robert L. York, *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966)

Robert Coles, *Children of Crisis. A Study of Courage and Fear* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967)

Committee on Race and Education, *Race and Equal Educational Opportunity in Portland's Public Schools* (Portland: Board of Education, October 29, 1964)

Community Relations Service, U. S. Department of Justice, *Report of the . . . Student Unrest Survey* (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Justice, September, 1969)

L. Madison Coombs, Ralph E. Kron, E. Gordon Collister, and Kenneth E. Anderson, *The Indian Child Goes to School. A Study of Interracial Differences* (Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1958)

Stanley Coopersmith, *Psychosocial Deprivation and the Development of Self-Esteem: Comments and Recommendations* (Bethesda, Maryland: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1968)

John Scott Cornelius, *The Effects of Certain Changes of Curriculum and Methods on the School Achievement of Mexican Children in a Segregated School* (Master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1941)

Oliver C. Cox, *Caste, Class, and Race: A Study in Social Dynamics* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1959, orig. 1948)

Robert L. Crain and others, *The Effects of De Facto School Segregation: A Survey of Negro Adults in Northern Cities,* unpublished study prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, November, 1966)

M. Richard Cramer, Charles E. Bowerman, and Ernest Q. Campbell, *Social Factors in Educational Achievement and Aspirations Among Negro Adolescents,* 2 vols. (Chapel Hill: Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, 1966)

Joan H. Criswell, A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavage in the Classroom (New York: Archives of Psychology, January 1939)

Mary R. Crowley, "Cincinnati's Experiment in Negro Education: A Comparative Study of the Segregated and Mixed School," Journal of Negro Education, 1 (1932)

Byron William Curtis, The Effects of Segregation on the Vocational Aspirations of Negro Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 605)

Lois-ellin Datta, Earl Schaefer, and Malcolm Davis, Sex and Scholastic Aptitude as Variables in Teachers' Ratings of the Adjustment and Classroom Behavior of Negro and Other Seventh Grade Students, 1966 (ERIC # ED 028 206)

Helen H. Davidson and Judith W. Greenberg, Traits of School Achievers from a Deprived Background (May, 1967) (ERIC # ED 013 849)

O. L. Davis, Jr. and Carl R. Personke, Jr., "Effects of Administering the Metropolitan Reading Test in English and Spanish to Spanish-Speaking School Entrants," Journal of Educational Measurement, Fall, 1968

Clyde De Berry and Robert E. Agger, "School and Race in Portland," Integrated Education, April-May, 1965

Arturo De Hoyos, Occupational and Educational Levels of Aspiration of Mexican-American Youth (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1961) (University Microfilms Order No. 61-2687)

Florence L. Denmark and Marcia Guttentag, "Effect of Integrated and Non-Integrated Programs on Cognitive Change in Pre-school Children," Perceptual and Motor Skills, 29 (1969)

________, ________, and Robert Riley, Communication Patterns in Integrated Classrooms and Pre-Integration Subject Variables as They Affect the Academic Achievement and Self-Concept of Previously Segregated Children, August, 1967 (ERIC # ED 016 721)

Wayne Dennis, "Racial Change in Negro Drawings," Journal of Psychology, 69 (1968)

Robert A. Dentler, "A Basis for Classifying Ethnic Composition of Schools," Memorandum No. 5 of the Education Complex Study (New York: Center for Urban Education)

________, "Equality of Educational Opportunity--A Special Review," Urban Review, December, 1966

Robert L. Derbyshire, "Adolescent Identity Crisis in Urban Mexican-Americans in East Los Angeles," in Eugene B. Brody (ed.), Minority Group Adolescents in the United States (Baltimore, Maryland: Williams and Wilkins, 1968)

________, Personal Identity: An Attitude Study of American Negro College Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1964) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-11, 098)

Anthony de Reuck and Julie Knight (eds.), Caste and Race (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967)

Martin Deutsch and Bert Brown, "Social Influences in Negro-White Intelligence Differences," Journal of Social Issues, April, 1964

Louis Diamant, "Relationships between Intelligence and Parental Attitude and Race Awareness in Five-Year-Olds," Journal of Social Psychology, 77 (1969)

Nelson Diaz-Mora, The Availability and Adequacy of Some Spanish Translated Tests (Master's thesis, Western Michigan University, 1969) (University Microfilms Order No. M 1832)

H. J. Dilling, "Educational Achievement and Social Acceptance of Indian Pupils Integrated in Non-Indian Schools of Southern Ontario," Ontario Journal of Educational Research, Autumn, 1965

Bernard E. Donovan, Evaluation of the Community Zoning Program. Summary Report (New York: Board of Education, September, 1966)

________, Summary of Proposed Programs 1967-1968. Title I--Elementary and Secondary Education Act (New York: Board of Education, August 30, 1967)

Ralph M. Dreger and Kent S. Miller, "Comparative Psychological Studies of Negroes and Whites in the United States, 1959-1965," Psychological Bulletin, Monograph Supplement, September, 1968

W. E. B. Du Bois, "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" Journal of Negro Education, July, 1935.

Dumbarton Research Council, Race and Education in the City of Oakland, draft, unpublished study prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (Menlo Park, California: Dumbarton Research Council, October, 1966)

Charlotte Jeanette Dunmore, Social-Psychological Factors Affecting the Use of an Educational Opportunity Program by Families Living in a Poverty Area (Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-9928)

Theodore F. Dunn, Assumed Racial Similarity as Related to Attitudes Toward Integration (Doctoral dissertation, American University, 1958), abstract in Dissertation Abstracts XIX, 1959

Kurt Robert Durig, A Study of Social Status and Occupational Choice Among High School Students (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-2283)

Troy Duster, "Violence and Civic Responsibility: Combinations of 'Fear' and 'Right,'" in Raymond W. Mack (ed.), Our Children's Burden (New York: Random House, 1968)

Robert J. Dwyer, "A Report on Patterns of Interaction in Desegregated Schools," Journal of Educational Sociology, March, 1958

Henry S. Dyer, Social Factors and Equal Educational Opportunity, paper presented before the American Psychological Association, September 3, 1967

Norman Eagle and Anna S. Harris, "Interaction of Race and Test on Reading Performance Scores," Journal of Educational Measurement, Fall, 1969

East Harlem Project and City Commission on Human Rights, Releasing Human Potential. A Study of East Harlem-Yorkville School Bus Transfer (New York: City Commission on Human Rights, 1962)

Everett D. Edington, *Recruitment of Spanish-Speaking Students Into Higher Education,* May, 1969 (ERIC # ED 031 320)

T. Bentley Edwards, "Teacher Attitudes and Cultural Differentiation," *Journal of Experimental Education,* Winter, 1966

Jack Elinson, Paul W. Haberman, and Cyrille Gell, *Ethnic and Educational Data on Adults in New York City, 1963-1964,* (New York: School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine, Columbia University, 1967)

Merle H. Elliott and Alden W. Badal, "Achievement and Racial Composition of Schools," *California Journal of Educational Research,* September, 1965

Desmond P. Ellis and James W. Wiggins, *Cooperation, Aggression and Learning in a Bi-racial Classroom,* September, 1968 (ERIC # ED 026 442)

Hanjorg Elshorst, "Two Years After Integration: Race Relations at a Deep South University," *Phylon,* Spring 1967

Doris R. Entwisle and Ellen Greenberger, *Differences in the Language of Negro and White Grade School Children 1, 2,* (May, 1968) (ERIC # ED 019 676)

Edgar G. Epps, "Correlates of Academic Achievement Among Northern and Southern Urban Negro Students," *Journal of Social Issues,* 25 (1969)

________, "Interpersonal Relations and Motivation: Implications for Teachers of Disadvantaged Children," *Journal of Negro Education,* 39 (1970)

Erik H. Erikson, "A Memorandum on Identity and Negro Youth," *Journal of Social Issues,* 20 (1964)

Aubrey Spencer Escoffery, *Personality and Behavior Correlates of Negro American Belief in "Fate-Control,"* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-134)

Evaluation of the Community Zoning Program. Summary Report (New York: Board of Education, September, 1966)

Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (New York: Grove Press, 1967)

William A. Farmer, *The Influence of Segregation of Mexican and American Children Upon the Development of Social*

Attitudes (Master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1937)

Joe Richard Feagin, *The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment: Structure and Variation* (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, March, 1966)

Harold A. Ferguson and Richard L. Plaut, "Talent: To Develop or to Lose," *Educational Record,* April, 1954

Joseph H. Fichter, *Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges, Class of 1964* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967)

________, *Negro Women Bachelors. A Comparative Exploration of the Experiences and Expectations of College Graduates of the Class of June, 1961* (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, January, 1965)

________, *Young Negro Talent--Survey of the Experiences and Expectations of Negro Americans Who Graduated from College in 1961* (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, November, 1964)

John K. Folger and Charles B. Nam, *Education of the American Population* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967)

Gordon B. Forbes and Marilyn Gipson, "Political Attitudes and Opinions, Need for Social Approval, Dogmatism and Anxiety in Negro and White College Students," *Journal of Negro Education,* Winter, 1969

Jack D. Forbes (ed.), *California Indian Education. Report on the First All-Indian Statewide Conference on California Indian Education* /1968/ Ad Hoc Committee on California Indian Education, 1349 Crawford Avenue, Modesto, California 95350

James H. Fortenberry, *The Achievement of Negro Pupils in Mixed and Non-Mixed Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1959) (University Microfilms Order No. 59-5492)

David J. Fox, *Free Choice Open Enrollment--Elementary Schools* (New York: Center for Urban Education, August 31, 1966)

Bonita B. Franks, *Some Social Determinants of Academic*

Success Among Culturally Disadvantaged Negro Children (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-8688

Jane Franseth and Rose Koury, Survey of Research on Grouping as Related to Pupil Learning (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966)

Sinai Israel Frenkel, A Comparison Between Negro and White College Students on Several Personality Measures (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1966)

Giora R. Frisch and Leonard Handler, "Differences in Negro and White Drawings: A Cultural Interpretation," Perceptual and Motor Skills, 24 (1967)

Robert Rogers Galvan, Bilingualism As It Relates to Intelligence Test Scores and School Achievement Among Culturally-Deprived Spanish-American Children (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-1131)

Henry E. Garrett, book review in Mankind Quarterly 9 (1968)

________, Children: Black and White (Kilmarnock, Virginia: Patrick Henry Press /1968/

________, Desegregation: Fact and Hokum (Richmond, Virginia: Patrick Henry Press, n. d.)

________, "Garrett's Stuff," Integrated Education, 6 (1968)

________, "How Classroom Desegregation Will Work," Citizen, October, 1965

________, How Classroom Desegregation Will Work, 5th ed. (Richmond, Virginia: Patrick Henry Press, 1966)

________, "How Classroom Desegregation Works," Citizen, February, 1966

________, "Negro-White Differences in Mental Ability in the United States," Scientific Monthly, 65 (1947)

Charles E. Garth, Self-Concepts of Negro Students Who Transferred or Did Not Transfer to Formerly All-White High Schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1963)

Thomas R. Garth, Bert E. Lovelady, and Hale W. Smith, "The Intelligence and Achievement of Southern Negro Children," *School and Society,* 32 (1930)

Odis Glenn Geiger, *Effects of Desegregation on Classroom Achievement* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-5796)

Paul N. Geisel, *I. Q. Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southern City: A Racial Comparison* (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962) (University Microfilms Order No. 63-1838)

John Stanley Geisler, *The Effects of a Compensatory Education Program on the Self-Concept and Academic Achievement of High School Age Youth from Low Income Families* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toledo, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-3425)

Peter John Georgeoff, *The Effect of the Curriculum Upon the Self-Concept of Children in Racially Integrated Fourth Grade Classrooms,* 1968 (ERIC # ED 017 020)

Harold B. Gerard, *Factors Contributing to Adjustment and Achievement* (Riverside, California: University of California, Los Angeles, May, 1968)

——— and Bertram H. Raven, *Intervention Programs to Overcome Psycho-Social Deficits* (Bethesda, Maryland: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1968)

Ghetto Schools (Washington, D. C.: New Republic Magazine, 1967)

Robert G. Gibby, Sr. and Robert Gabler, "The Self-Concepts of Negro and White Children," *Journal of Clinical Psychology,* 23 (1967)

Burt E. Gilliland, *An Evaluation of the Effects of Small Group Counseling with Negro Adolescents* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-1364)

Noel P. Gist and William S. Bennett, "Aspirations of Negro and White Students," *Social Forces,* October, 1963

A. George Gitter and Harvey Black, *Expression and*

Perception of Emotion: Race and Sex, May 1968 (ERIC # ED 029 313)

Regina M. Goff, "Some Educational Implications of the Influence of Rejection on Aspiration Levels of Minority Group Children," *Journal of Experimental Education,* December, 1954

Faye J. Goldberg and Gloria Cowan, "Achievement Motivation and Fantasy Production as a Function of the Race and Sex of the TAT Figures," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans, March 31, 1966

Herman R. Goldberg, John H. Griffith, Russell F. Green, and Orrin H. Bowman, *An Interim Report on a Fifteen Point Plan to Reduce Racial Isolation and Provide Quality Integrated Education* (Rochester, New York: Board of Education, July, 1969)

Harold S. Goldblatt and Cyril Tyson, *Some Self Perceptions and Teacher Evaluations of Puerto Rican, Negro, and White Pupils in 4th, 5th, and 6th Grades,* Research Report No. 12 (New York: City Commission on Human Rights, 1962)

Paul C. Goldin, "A Model for Racial Awareness Training of Teachers in Integrated Schools," *Integrated Education,* 8 (1970)

Norman S. Goldner, *The Mexican in the Northern Urban Area: A Comparison of Two Generations* (Master's thesis, University of Minnesota, 1959)

Bernard Goldstein, Harry C. Bredemeier, William M. Phillips, Jr., and Coralie Farlee, *Social and Cultural Factors Related to School Achievement,* June, 1967 (ERIC # ED 014 763)

Anna Nieto Gomez and J. Anthony Vasquez, *The Needs of the Chicano on the College Campus,* May, 1969 (ERIC # ED 031 323)

Mary Ellen Goodman, "Evidence Concerning the Genesis of Interracial Attitudes," *American Anthropologist* 48 (1946)

Edmund W. Gordon, "Equalizing Educational Opportunity in the Public School," *IRCD Bulletin,* November, 1967

________ and Adelaide Jablonsky, *Compensatory Education in* *the Equalization of Educational Opportunity,* unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967

________ and Doxey A. Wilkerson, "Critique of Compensatory Education," in *Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966)

John Edward Gordon, Jr., *The Effects on White Student Teachers of Value Clarification Interviews with Negro Pupils* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1965)

Leonard Gordon, *An Acculturation Analysis of Negro and White High School Students: The Effects on Social and Academic Behavior of Initial Close Interracial Association at the Secondary Level* (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-660)

________, "The Carver-Oak Park Merger," *Integrated Education,* June-July, 1965

David A. Goslin, "The School in a Changing Society," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,* October, 1967

David Gottlieb, "Goal Aspirations and Goal Fulfillments: Differences Between Deprived and Affluent American Adolescents," unpublished paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, March 19, 1964

________, "Poor Youth Do Want to Be Middle Class. But It's Not Easy," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* October, 1967

________, "Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers," August, 1963. Later published in *Sociology of Education,* Summer, 1964

Martin F. Graves and Frederick D. Bedell, *A Three Year Evaluation of the White Plains Racial Balance Plan* (White Plains, New York: Board of Education, October 16, 1967)

James A. Green, *Racial Awareness and Identification in Young Children,* paper read at the American Psychological

Association, September, 1969

________, *School Desegregation and Achievement Related Attitudes*, introductory talk at American Psychological Association, September, 1969

Norman C. Greenberg, *Administrative Problems Related to Integration of Navajo Indians in Public Education* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1963)

Meg Greenfield, "What is Racial Balance in the Schools?" *Reporter*, March 23, 1967

Herbert J. Greenwald and Don B. Oppenheim, "Reported Magnitude of Self-Misidentification Among Negro Children--Artifact?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 8 (1968)

A. James Gregor, "Black Nationalism: A Preliminary Analysis of Negro Radicalism," *Science and Society*, Fall, 1963

________, "On Learned Ignorance: A Brief Inquiry into I.A. Newby's Challenge to the Court," in I. A. Newby, *Challenge to the Court*, 2nd ed. (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1969)

________, "Social Science Research and the Education of the Minority-Group Child," in I. A. Newby, *Challenge to the Court*, 2nd ed. (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1969)

________ and D. Angus McPherson, "Racial Attitudes Among White and Negro Children in a Deep South Standard Metropolitan Area," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 68 (1966)

Karl D. Gregory, "The Walkout: Symptom of Dying Inner City Schools," *New University Thought*, Spring, 1967

Eunice S. Grier, *In Search of a Future. A Pilot Study of the Career-Seeking Experiences of Selected High School Graduates in Washington, D.C.* (Washington, D.C.: Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, January, 1963)

Joyce Griffen, *Family Structure and School Performance: A Comparative Study of Students from Three Ethnic Backgrounds in an Integrated School* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 65-13, 334)

Neal Gross, Walter O. Jewell, III, Ralph G. Lewis, and Eigel D. Pederson, "Some Sociological Correlates of the 'Academic Productivity' of Urban Elementary Schools with Pupils from Families of Low Socio-Economic Status," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August, 1966

Manuel H. Guerra *et al.*, *The Retention of Mexican-American Students in Higher Education with Special Reference to Bicultural and Bilingual Problems,* May, 1969 (ERIC # ED 031 324)

Fred Guggenheim, "Self-Esteem and Achievement Expectations for White and Negro Children," *Journal of Protective Techniques and Personality Assessment,* 33 (1969)

Muriel B. Gunthorpe, *A Comparison of Negro and White Student Participation in Selected Classes of Junior High School Program* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1964) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-8477)

Patricia Gurin, Gerald Gurin, Rosina C. Lao, and Muriel Beattie, "Internal-External Control in the Motivation Dynamics of Negro Youth," *Journal of Social Issues,* 25 (1969)

________ and Daniel Katz, *Motivation and Aspiration in the Negro College,* November, 1966 (ERIC # ED 010 537)

R. J. Hader, "Random Roommate Pairings of Negro and White Students," *American Statistician,* 21 (1967)

Warren C. Haggstrom, "Segregation, Desegregation, and Negro Personality," *Integrated Education,* October-November, 1963

________, *Self-Esteem and Other Characteristics of Residentially Desegregated Negroes* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962) (University Microfilms Order No. 63-359)

Morrill M. Hall and Harold W. Gentry, "Isolation of Negro Students in Integrated Public Schools," *Journal of Negro Education,* Spring, 1969

A. Irving Hallowell, *Culture and Experience* (Philadelphia:

University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955)

Alpha J. Hammond, Lucy M. Sawhill, and Robert B. Williams, *A Survey of the Adjustment of the Negro Students Who Transferred to Schools Outside Their Neighborhoods During 1963-1964 Under the New Seattle School Board Ruling* (Master's thesis, University of Washington, 1964)

June M. Handler, *An Attempt to Change Kindergarten Children's Attitudes of Prejudice Toward the Negro* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-2804)

Carl F. Hansen, "The Scholastic Performance of Negro and White Pupils in the Integrated Public Schools of the District of Columbia," *Harvard Educational Review*, Summer, 1960

Edythe Hargrave, "How I Feel as a Negro at a White College," *Journal of Negro Education*, October, 1942)

Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., *Youth in the Ghetto. A study of the Consequences of Powerlessness and a Blueprint for Change* (New York: HARYOU, 1964)

Berj Harootunian, *Self-Other Relationships of Segregated and Desegregated Ninth Graders*, February 8, 1968 (ERIC # ED 023 765)

________ and Richard J. Morse, *Characteristics of Negro and White High School Students Prior to Desegregation. A Study of Negro Students' Freedom of Choice*, September, 1968 (ERIC # ED 024 745)

Albert J. Harris and Robert J. Lovinger, *Some Longitudinal Data on I. Q. Changes in the Intelligence of Negro Adolescents* (New York: City University of New York, 1967)

Gary Reeves Harris, *A Study of the Academic Achievement of Selected Negro and White Fifth-Grade Pupils When Educational Ability Is Held Constant* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-6738)

Philip M. Hauser, Chairman, *Report to the Board of Education, City of Chicago, by the Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools* (Chicago: Board of

Education, March 31, 1964)

Robert W. Heath and Larnders Roy (eds.), *Interviews with Seven Black High School Students* (Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, December, 1969)

Celia S. Heller, *Ambitions of Mexican-American Youth. Goals and Means of Mobility of High School Seniors* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1964) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-11, 296)

William C. Helton, *Characteristics, Performance, Problems, and Successes of Negro Graduate Students Enrolled in Five Predominantly White State Colleges and Universities in Tennessee, 1963-1965* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-7478)

George Henderson, "Role Models for Lower Class Negro Boys," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 46 (1967-68)

Irving Hendrick, *The Development of a School Integration Plan in Riverside, California: A History and Perspective* (Riverside, California: Riverside School Study, University of California, Riverside, September, 1968)

Robert E. Herriott and Benjamin Hodgkins, *Sociocultural Context and the American School: An Open-Systems Analysis of Educational Opportunity*, January, 1969 (ERIC # ED 028 502)

——— and Nancy H. St. John, *Social Class and the Urban School. The Impact of Pupil Background on Teachers and Principals* (New York: Wiley, 1966)

Margaret E. Hertzig, Herbert G. Birch, Alexander Thomas, and Olga Aran Mendez, *Class and Ethnic Differences in the Responsiveness of Preschool Children to Cognitive Demands* (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1968)

Nathaniel Hickerson, "Integrated vs. Compensatory Education in the Riverside-San Bernardino Schools," in T. Bentley Edwards and Frederick M. Wirt (eds.), *School Desegregation in the North* (San Francisco, California: Chandler, 1967)

Leo Baron Hicks, Sr., *Apprentice Teaching and Exposure to Additional Information on Methods of Attitude Modification in Negro Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-11, 874)

Robert A. Hicks and Robert J. Pellegrini, "The Meaningfulness of Negro-White Differences in Intelligence Test Performance," *Psychological Record*, January, 1966

Charles Au Hildebrandt, *The Relationship of Some Personal and Social Variables of School Children to Preferences for Mixed Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962) (University Microfilms Order No. 62-2503)

Henry T. Hillson and Florence C. Myers, *The Demonstration Guidance Project, 1957-1962. Pilot Program for Higher Horizons* (New York: Board of Education, 1963)

Arthur Edwin Hippler, *Family Structure and Social Structure: Matrifocality in Hunter's Point* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-3613)

Hobson v. *Hansen*, *Congressional Record*, June 21, 1967

Benjamin J. Hodgkins and Robert G. Stakenas, "A Study of Self-Concepts of Negro and White Youth in Segregated Environments," *Journal of Negro Education*, 38 (1969)

Florence N. Holland, "A Comment on the Segregated Learning Situation as an Insulating Device for the Negro Child," *Psychiatry*, August, 1964

Clifton D. Hollister, *Bureaucratic Structure and School-Parent Communication in Eighteen Detroit Elementary Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-8277)

Sidney Hook, Dan Cooperman, Charles H. Foster, Laura H. Ryne, and Edward E. Malkins (letters, *Dissent*, Spring, 1959; Margaret Halsey, *ibid.*, Summer, 1959)

David E. Hunt and Robert H. Hardt, "The Effect of Upward Bound Programs on the Attitudes, Motivation, and Academic Achievement of Negro Students," *Journal of*

Social Issues, 25 (1969)

Charlayne Hunter, "A Homecoming for the First Black Girl at the University of Georgia," New York Times Magazine, January 25, 1970

Carolyn F. Huson and Michael E. Schiltz, College, Color, and Employment. Racial Differentials in Postgraduate Employment Among 1964 Graduates of Louisiana Colleges (Chicago: National Research Center, July, 1966)

The Interuniversity Social Research Committee--Chicago Metropolitan Area, Militancy for and Against Civil Rights and Integration in Chicago: Summer, 1967 (Chicago: Community and Family Center, University of Chicago, August 1, 1967)

Invitational Conference on Northern School Desegregation, Proceedings (New York: Yeshiva University, 1962)

Anna Mae Jackson, Differential Characteristics of Reasoning Ability in Negroes and Whites (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-2604)

Jonathan Jackson and David Kirkpatrick, A Report: Institute for the Preparation of Counselors and Teacher-Counselors for Effective Service and Leadership in Desegregated Schools, November, 1967 (ERIC # ED 020 557)

Lenore F. Jacobson, Explorations of Variations in Educational Achievement Among Mexican Children, Grades One to Six (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-15, 306)

Fred Janney, Sharon Mallory, Richard Rossitto, and John Simon, "Conformity as a Function of Race and Age," Psychological Reports, 25 (1969)

Manmohan Singh Jawa, Academic Development, Group Dynamics, and Motivation Variables of Disadvantaged Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-28)

Christopher Jencks, "Education: The Racial Gap," New Republic, October 1, 1966

Raymond L. Jerrems, A Sociological-Educational Study of a

Public School in a Negro Lower-Class Area of a Big City (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965)

Harold T. Johnson and Harold L. Tyer, *Special Training Institute on Desegregation for Educational Systems of the First District of Georgia,* October 30, 1967 (ERIC # ED 030 684)

Norman J. Johnson, Robert Wyer, and Neil Gilbert, "Quality Education and Integration: An Exploratory Study," *Phylon,* Fall, 1967

Harold A. Jonsson, *Report of Evaluation of ESEA Title I Compensatory Activities for 1966-67* (Berkeley, California: Berkeley Unified School District, 1967)

________, *Maternal, Teacher and Pupil Attitudes Toward Busing, Integration, and Related Issues in Berkeley Elementary Schools* (Berkeley: Berkeley Unified School District, October, 1966)

Charles C. Josey, *An Inquiry Concerning Racial Prejudice* (New York: International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, Inc., 1965)

David E. Kapel, *Effects of Negro Density on Student Variables and the Post-High School Adjustment of Male Negroes* (Palo Alto, California: Project TALENT, American Institutes for Research, 1968)

Henry K. Kaplan and Anthony J. Matkom, "Peer Status and Intellectual Functioning of Negro School Children," *Psychology in the Schools,* April, 1967

Irwin Katz, "A Critique of Personality Approaches to Negro Performance, With Research Suggestions," *Journal of Social Issues,* 25 (1969)

________, *Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools? The Policy Implications of Research,* unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967

________, "Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools: The Policy Implications of Research," *Integrated Education,* 5 (1967-1968)

________, "Factors Influencing Negro Performance in the

Desegregated School," in Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz, and Arthur R. Jensen (eds.), *Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968)

________, (Reply to review by Nichols in December 9, 1966 issue of *Science* (*Science*, May 13, 1967)

________, "Research on Public School Desegregation," *Integrated Education*, August-September, 1966 (a revised version published late in 1967 by the IRCD, Yeshiva University)

________, "Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes," *American Psychologist*, June, 1964

________, "Some Motivational Determinants of Racial Differences in Intellectual Achievement," 1966, to appear in the *International Journal of Psychology*

________, "The Socialization of Academic Motivation in Minority Group Children," in David Levine (ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1967* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967)

________, "Status of Research on School Desegregation," *IRCD Bulletin*, September, 1965

________, and Patricia Gurin (eds.), *Race and the Social Sciences*, New York: Basic Books, 1969

William G. Katzenmeyer, *Social Interaction and Differences in Intelligence Test Performance of Negro and White Elementary School Pupils* (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1962) (University Microfilms Order No. 63-2227)

Suzanne Keller and Marisa Zavalloni, "Ambition and Social Class: A Respecification," *Social Forces*, October 1964

Wallace A. Kennedy, "A Follow-Up Normative Study of Negro Intelligence and Achievement," unpublished paper read to the 1966 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association

________, *A Follow-Up Normative Study of Negro Intelligence and Achievement* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969)

________, V. Van de Riet, and James C. White, *The Standardization of the 1960 Revising of the Stanford-Benet Intelligence Scale on Negro Elementary School Children in the Southeastern United States* (Tallahassee: Human Development Clinic, Florida State University, 1961)

Felix Kessler, "Integration Misfire," *Wall Street Journal*, October 12, 1966

J. Roby Kidd, "Education of the Canadian Indian and Eskimo," *Integrated Education*, December, 1966-January, 1967

William L. Kimball, *Parent and Family Influences on Academic Achievement Among Mexican American Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-16, 550)

Jackie Kimbrough, *Toward a Conceptualization of Militancy*, paper read at the American Psychological Association meeting, September, 1969

John Randle King, *An Inquiry Into the Status of Mexican Segregation in Metropolitan Bakersfield* (Master's thesis, Claremont Graduate School, 1946)

Bernard C. Kinnick and Stanton D. Platter, "Attitudinal Change Toward Negroes and School Desegregation Among Participants in a Summer Training Institute," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 73 (1967)

Robert Stanley Klein, *A Comparative Study of the Academic Achievement of Negro 10th Grade High School Students Attending Segregated and Recently Integrated Schools in a Metropolitan Area of the South* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15, 565)

Ellis O. Knox, *Democracy and the District of Columbia Schools. A Study of Recently Integrated Public Schools* (Washington, D.C.: Judd and Detweiler, 1957)

Sandra Cohen Koslin, Book review, *Education and Urban Society*, 2 (1969)

________, Marianne Amarel, and Nancy Ames, "A Distance Measure of Racial Attitudes in Primary Grade Children: An Exploratory Study," *Psychology in the Schools*, October, 1969

________, Bertram L. Koslin, John Cardwell, and Richard Pargament, "A Quasi-disguised and Structured Measure of School-children's Racial Preferences," paper delivered at annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September, 1969

________, ________, Richard Pargament, and Harvey Waxman, "Effects of School Balance on Racial Attitudes," no date

Eric R. Krystall, Mark A. Chesler, and Agatha E. White, *Voting Behavior and Attitudes Toward School Desegregation: A Study of Southern Negroes* (Tuskegee, Alabama: Department of Social Science Research, Tuskegee Institute, March, 1967

Joyce Ann Ladner, *On Becoming a Woman in the Ghetto: Modes of Alienation* (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-17, 190)

Jacob Landers, "A Letter to the Editor," *Integrated Education,* February-March, 1967

________, *Higher Horizons Progress Report* (New York Board of Education, 1963)

________, Testimony at Public Hearing on "Education in New York City for Low Income Youngsters," November 16, 1967

Frank F. Lee, *Negro and White in Connecticut Town* (New York Bookman, 1961)

Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, *Six-City Study. A Survey of Racial Attitudes in Six Northern Cities: Preliminary Findings* (Waltham, Massachusetts: Brandeis University, June, 1967

Ronald S. Lenkowsky and Leonard S. Blackman, "The Effect of Teachers' Knowledge of Race and Social Class on their Judgments of Children's Academic Competence and Social Acceptability," *Mental Retardation*, 6 (1968)

Gerald S. Lesser, Gordon Fifer, and Donald H. Clark, *Mental Abilities of Children from Different Social-Class and Cultural Groups* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965)

________, Kristine M. Rosenthal, Sally E. Polkoff, and Marjorie B. Pfankuch, "Some Effects of Segregation and Desegregation in the Schools," Integrated Education, June-July, 1964

Elise E. Lessing, "Racial Differences in Indices of Ego Functioning Relevant to Academic Achievement," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 115 (1969)

Daniel U. Levine and Norman S. Fiddmont, "Integration Is Up to Date in Kansas City," Integrated Education, 7 (1969)

Howard Edwin Lewis, A Descriptive Study of Self-Concept and General Creativity of Southern and Northern Undergraduate Students (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-597)

Sinclair O. Lewis, comment in Counselor Education and Supervision, 9 (1969)

________, "Racism Encountered in Counseling," Counselor Education and Supervision, 9 (1969)

Aaron Lipton, "Classroom Grouping and Integration," Integrated Education, February-March, 1964

________, "Day-to-Day Problems of School Integration," Integrated Education, June-July, 1965

Don W. Locke, comment in Counseler Education and Supervision, 9 (1969)

Jane D. Lockwood, An Examination of Scholastic Achievement, Attitudes, and Home Background Factors of Sixth-Grade Negro Students in Balanced and Unbalanced Schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966)

Rayford W. Logan, "Educational Segregation in the North," Journal of Negro Education, January, 1933

Donald N. Lombardi, "Factors Affecting Change in Attitude Toward Negroes Among High School Students," Journal of Negro Education, Spring, 1963

Barbara H. Long and Edmund H. Henderson, "Self-Concepts of Disadvantaged School Beginners," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, September, 1966

David Long, *Educational Performance in Integrated and Segregated Elementary Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-10, 982)

Howard Hale Long, "Some Psychogenic Hazards of Segregated Education of Negroes," *Journal of Negro Education,* IV (1935)

________, "Test Results of Third-Grade Negro Children Selected on the Basis of Socioeconomic Status, 1," *Journal of Negro Education*, IV (1935)

Dean R. Lusienski, *An Analysis of the Scores of Urban Negro Boys on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1964) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-11, 936)

Bernard Mackler, "Grouping in the Ghetto," *Education and Urban Society,* 2 (1969)

Robert Wilson MacMillan, *A Study of the Effect of Socio-economic Factors on the School Achievement of Spanish-Speaking School Beginners* (Doctoral dissertationm University of Texas, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-3327)

James G. Maddox with E. E. Liebhafsky, Vivian W. Henderson, and Herbert M. Hamlin, *The Advancing South. Manpower Prospects and Problems* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1967)

Aline M. Mahan and Thomas W. Mahan, "Changes in Cognitive Style: An Analysis of the Impact of White Suburban Schools on Inner City Children" *Integrated Education,* 8 (1970)

Bruce L. Maliver, *Anti-Negro Bias Among Negro College Students* (Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1964 (University Microfilms Order No. 64-10, 006)

Lenton Malry, *The Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Anglo, Spanish, and Negro High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-9284)

Leonard A. Masascuilo and Joel R. Levin, "Inter- and Intra-Racial Group Differences in the Perception of a

Social Situation," unpublished paper read at the February, 1966, annual meeting of the American Education Research Association

Oliver Wendell Markley, *Having a Negro Roommate As An Experience in Intercultural Education* (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-1890)

Gary T. Marx, Protest and Prejudice. *A study of Belief in the Black Community* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967)

Carolyn Weesner Matthiasson, *Acculturation of Mexican-Americans in a Midwestern City* (Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-5766)

Stanley P. Matzen, *The Relationship Between Racial Composition and Scholastic Achievement in Elementary School Classrooms* (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-2518)

George Mayeske, *Educational Achievement Among Mexican-Americans: A Special Report from the Educational Opportunities Survey*. Analytical Note No. 50. Washington, D. C.: Division of Operations Analysis, National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Office of Education, January 9, 1967

________, "Educational Achievement Among Mexican-Americans: A Special Report from the Educational Opportunities Survey," *Integrated Education*, 6 (1968)

________, *Teacher Attributes and School Achievement*, paper presented at a U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education Professions Development Symposium, "How Do Teacher's Make a Difference?" February 12, 1970

________, Frederic D. Weinfeld, and Albert E. Beaton, Jr., *Item Response Analyses of the Educational Opportunities Survey Teacher Questionnaire, Analytical* Note No. 59 (Washington, D.C.: Division of Operations Analysis, National Center for Educational Statistics, May 18, 1967

________, Carl E. Wisler, Albert E. Beaton, Jr., Frederic D. Weinfeld, Wallace M. Cohem, Tetsuo Okoda, John M. Proshek, and Kenneth S. Tabler, *A*

Study of Our Nation's Schools (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969?)

Marion Jacob Mayo, "The Mental Capacity of the American Negro," reprinted from the Archives of Psychology, No. 28, November, 1913

Edward L. McDill, Mary S. McDill, and J. Timothy Sprehe, Strategies for Success in Compensatory Education: An Appraisal of Evaluation Research (Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkins Press, 1970)

________, Leo C. Rigsby, and Edmund D. Meyersm Jr., Educational Climate of High Schools: Their Effect and Sources, April, 1969 (ERIC # ED 030 205)

Sophia Fagin McDowell, The Willingness of Negro Youths to Associate with Whites (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1967)

F. C. J. McGurk, Comparison of the Performance of Negro and White High School Seniors on Cultural and Non-cultural Psychological Test Questions (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of American Press, 1956)

Floyd McKissick, "Is Integration Necessary?" New Republic, December 3, 1966

James McPartland, The Relative Influence of School Desegregation and of Classroom Desegregation on the Academic Achievement of Ninth GradeStudents. Final Report (Baltimore, Maryland: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, John Hopkins University, 1968)

Ronald Alfred McWhirt, The Effects of Desegregation on Prejudice, Academic Aspiration, and the Self-Concept of Tenth Grade Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15, 568)

Donald E. Meeks, Race, Social Class, and Level of Aspiration: The Effect of Race and Social Class on the Goal-Striving Behavior of White and Negro Boys (Doctoral dissertation, Smith College, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-907)

Deborah Meier, "The Coleman Report," Integrated Education, December, 1967

Betty F. Meketon, The Effects of Integration Upon the Negro

Child's Response to Various Tasks and Upon His Level of Self-Esteem (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1966)

Jane R. Mercer, "Issues and Dilemmas in School Desegregation: A Case Study," *Western Regional Conference on Testing Problems Proceedings,* 1968 (reprint)

Edmund Dean Meyers, Jr., *Effects of Social and Educational Climate of High Schools Upon the Academic Performance of Negro and White Adolescents* (Doctoral dissertation, John Hopkins University, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-13,817)

Edna O. Meyers, "Self-Concept, Family Structure and School Achievement: A Study of Disadvantaged Negro Boys," (abstract) (New York: Northside Center for Child Development, n.d.)

———, *Self-Concept, Family Structure and School Achievement:* A Study of Disadvantaged Negro Boys (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-5540)

Norman A. Milgram and Mark N. Ozer, "Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Scores of Pre-School Children," *Psychological Reports,* 20 (1967)

Charles K. Miller, John A. McLaughlin, John Haddon, and Norman A. Chansky, "Socioeconomic Class and Teacher Bias," *Psychological Reports,* 23 (1968)

Harold J. Miller, *The Effects of Integration on Rural Indian Pupils* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-2560)

Harry J. Miller, "The Relation of Social Class to Slum School Attitudes Among Education Students in an Urban College," *Journal of Teacher Education,* 19 (1968)

Norman Miller and Jerry Zadny, *Delay of Gratification in Black, White, and Mexican-American Elementary School Children,* paper read at the American Psychological Association, September, 1969

Ronald Lester Mock, *The Relationship Among Children Between Conformity and the Racial Composition of Small Quasi-Groups* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1968) (University Microfilms

Order No. 69-3658)

Kent G. Mommsen, "Valuation of Alternative Success Means by Race, Sex, Ability and Socioeconomic Status," Appendix C in Rhodes, below.

Charles Monroe, "A 'Basic Program' in Junior College," Integrated Education, January, 1963

Alexander M. Mood, Murray Spitzer, David S. Stoller, and Frederick D. Weinfeld, "Are Better Schools Better?" Science, May 12, 1967

William Moore, Jr., A Portrait: The Culturally Disadvantage Pre-School Child (Doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1964) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-13,475)

Thomas Earl Moorefield, The Busing of Minority Group Children in a Big City School System (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1967)

J. Kenneth Morland, "A Comparison of Race Awareness in Northern and Southern Children," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, January, 1966

________, "Race Awareness among American and Hong Kong Chinese Children," American Journal of Sociology, 75 (1969)

________, "Racial Acceptance and Preference of Nursery School Children in a Southern City," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly VIII (1962)

________, "Racial Recognition in Nursery School Children in Lynchburg, Virginia," Social Forces, December, 1958

________, "Racial Self-Identification: A Study of Nursery School Children," American Catholic Sociological Review, Fall, 1963

________, "The Development of Racial Bias in Young Children," Theory Into Practice II (1963)

________, Token Desegregation and Beyond (New York: Anti-Defamation League, 1963)

Donald E. Muir and C. Donald McGlamery, "The Evolution of Desegregation Attitudes of Southern University Students," Phylon, 29 (1968)

A. J. Muste, "The Civil Right Movement and the American Establishment," Liberation, February, 1965

Louis H. Muzehari, "Relationships Between the Goodenough

Dam and Stanford-Binet in Negro and White Public School Children," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 23, (1967)

Frederic B. Nalven, Louis J. Hofmann, and Bruce Bierbryer, "The Effects of Subjects' Age, Sex, Race and Socio-economic Status on Psychologists' Estimates of 'True IQ' from WISC Scores," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 25 (1969)

Charles B. Nam, A. Lewis Rhodes, and Robert E. Herriott, Inequalities in Educational Opportunities. A Demographic Analysis of Educational Differences in the Population (Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State University, May, 1966)

Kermit B. Nash, "Mental Health in the Desegregated School," Integrated Education, 5 (1967-1968)

National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, Detroit, Michigan. A Study of Barriers to Equal Educational Opportunities in a Large City (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, March, 1967)

New York City Board of Education, Demonstration Guidance Project, Fourth Annual Progress Report, 1959-1960 (New York: Board of Education, 1961)

New York City Public Schools, The Puerto Rican Study, 1953-1957: A Report on the Education and Adjustment of Puerto Rican Pupils in the Public Schools of the City of New York (New York: Board of Education, 1958)

I. A. Newby, Challenge to the Court. Social Scientists and the Defense of Segregation, 1954-1966 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1967). Second edition, 1969)

Robert C. Nichols, Book review, American Education Research Journal 5 (1968)

________, (Rejoinder to letters by Katz, Mood, and others) Science, May 12, 1967

________, "Schools and the Disadvantaged," Science, December 9, 1966

Donald L. Noel, "Minority Group Identification and Societal Integration," unpublished paper presented at the 1966 annual meeting of the American Sociological

Association

George E. North and O. Lee Buchanan, "Teacher Views of Poverty Area Children," *Journal of Educational Research*, October, 1967

Daniel P. Norton and Jayjia Hsia, *Evaluation of Integration of Evanston District 65 Schools*. Interim Report (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, June, 1969)

Andrew Lewis O'Connor III, *The Relationship of Imitation to Intelligence and Scholastic Achievement of Negro and White First Grade Pupils in Integrated Classes* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-13, 023)

William R. Odell, *Educational Survey Report for the Philadelphia Board of Public Education.* (Philadelphia: Board of Public Education, February 1, 1965)

Deborah I. Offenbacher, Cultures in Conflict. *Home and School as Seen Through the Eyes of Lower Class Students* (January, 1969) (ERIC # ED 027 361)

Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Much Better than They Expected," *Integrated Education*, 8 (1970)

Robert P. O'Reilly and Associates, *Racial and Social Class Isolation in the Schools* (Albany, New York: Division of Research, Office of Research and Evaluation, New York State Education Department, December, 1969)

Elinor Pancoast, The Report of a Study on Desegregation in the Baltimore City Schools (Baltimore: Maryland Commission on Interracial Problems and Relations, 1956)

Theodore W. Parsons, Jr., *Ethnic Cleavage in a California School* (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-2602)

A. Harry Passow, *Toward Creating a Model Urban School System: A Study of the Washington, D.C. Public Schools* (New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, September, 1967

Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Company, "Analysis of Student Enrollment of One Hundred Largest School Districts," Jackson, Mississippi, August 6, 1969

Fernando Penalosa and Edward C. McDonogh, "Education, Economic Status and Social-Class Awareness of Mexican-Americans," *Phylon*, 29 (1968)

Thomas F. Pettigrew, *A Profile of the Negro American* (Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1964)

________, *The Consequences of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools: Another Look*, unpublished paper prepared for the National Conferences on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967

________, "The Negro and Education: Problems and Proposals," in Irwin Katz and Patricia Gurin (eds.) *Race and the Social Sciences* New York: Basic Books, 1969)

________, *Race and Equal Educational Opportunity*, unpublished paper presented before the American Psychological Association, September 3, 1967

________, "Race and Equal Educational Opportunity," *Harvard Educational Review*, Winter, 1968

________, "Social Evaluation Theory: Convergences and Applications," in David Levine (ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1967* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1967)

________, and Patricia J. Pajonas, *Social Psychological Considerations of Racially Imbalanced Schools*, published by the Massachusetts State Board of Education in April, 1965

Chester M. Pierce, "Problems of the Negro Adolescent in the Next Decade," in Eugene B. Brody (ed.), *Minority Group Adolescents in the United States* (Baltimore, Maryland: Williams and Wilkins, 1968)

Joan C. Platoff, *The Effect of Education and Race on the Language and Attitudes Verbally Expressed by Mothers of Preschool Children* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-6165)

Carmen A. Posner, *Some Effects of Genetic and Cultural Variables on Self-Evaluations of Children* (Doctoral dissertation, Illinois Institute of Technology, 1969)

University Microfilms Order No. 69-9835)

Alice Mendhal Powell, Racial Awareness and Social Behavior in an Interracial Four-Year-Old Group (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1958) (University Microfilms

Christus N. Powell, Factors Affecting the Educational and Vocational Plans of High Ability Negro Students in the High Schools of Alabama (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1963) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-5382)

Philip S. Pratt, A Comparison of the School Achievement and Socio-Economic Background of Mexican and White Children in a Delta Colorado Elementary School (Master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1938)

President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, The People Left Behind (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, September, 1967)

Paul N. Prichard, "Effects of Desegregation on Student Success in the Chapel Hill City Schools," Integrated Education, 7 (1969)

Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, Improving Quality During School Desegregation, February, 1969 (ERIC # ED 029 363)

Roderick W. Pugh, "A Comparative Study of the Adjustment of Negro Students in Mixed and Separate High Schools," Journal of Negro Education 12 (1943)

Mabel C. Purl, Progress Report (Riverside, California: Riverside School Study, October 15, 1968

________, Training and Assessing Cognitive Skills in First Grade Children in Segregated and Integrated Classels rooms (Doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-10,534)

________, and Jerry S. Carlson, Research in Cognitive Development. Emerson School McAteer Project M-14 (Riverside. California: Riverside School Study, August, 1969)

________, and Chris Kleinke, Comparative Data for the Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test and Stanford

Reading Test (Riverside, California: Riverside School Study, September, 1969)

Carleton Putnam, *Race and Reality*. *A Search for Solutions* Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1967)

Norma Radin, *A Comparison of the Test Performance of Negro Students Attending All-Negro and Integrated Elementary Schools in One Community,* Ypsilanti, Michigan Pbulic Schools, April 15, 1966, unpublished

Marion J. Radke, Jean Sutherland, and Pearl Rosenberg, "Racial Attitudes of Children," Sociometry, 13 (1950)

________, and Helen G. Trager, "Children's Perceptions of the Social Roles of Negroes and Whites," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 29 (1950)

________, ________, and Hadassah Davis, "Social Perceptions and Attitudes of Children," *Genetic Psychology Monographs,* 40 (1949)

Wilson Record, "The White Professional Educators and the Black Ghetto Schools," *Journal of Negro Education,* 39 (1970)

David Redfearn, *Level of Expectation, Actual Performance, and Reaction to Success and Failure in Three Ethnic Groups,* paper read at the American Psychological Association, September, 1969

Research Department, City School District, Syracuse, New York, "Study of the Effect of Integration--Croton and Edward Smith Elementary School Pupils," pp. 327-328 in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hearing Held in Rochester, New York, September 16-17, 1966* (Washington, D.C: Government Printing Office, 1967)

Research Department, City School District, Syracuse, New York, "Study of the Effect of Integration--Washington Irving and Host Pupils," pp. 323-326 in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hearing Held in Rochester, New York, September 16-17, 1966* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967)

Residents of Bedford-Stuyvesant, *Community Attitudes in Bedford-Stuyvesant: An Area Study, Summer, 1967* (New York: Center for Urban Education, July, 1968)

Albert Lewis Rhodes, *Effect of Parental Expectations on*

Educational Plans of White and NonWhite Adolescents, September, 1968 (ERIC # ED 027 096)

Bert O. Richmond, Creative and Cognitive Abilities of White and Negro Children, 1968 (ERIC # ED 030 922)

Herta Riese, Heal the Hurt Child. An Approach Through Educational Therapy With Special Reference to the Extremely Deprived Negro Child (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962)

Frank Riessman, Workers' Attitudes Toward Participation and Leadership (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1955) (University Microfilms Order No. 13,999)

Ramon J. Rivera, Gerald A. McWorter, and Ernst Lillienstein, "Freedom Day II in Chicago," Integrated Education, August-September, 1964

Frederick A. Rodgers, "Gain in Programed and Flexible Presentations," Elementary School Journal, 68 (1967-1968)

Hyman Rodman and Patricia Voydanoff, Social Class and Parents' Aspirations for Their Children, August, 1968 (ERIC # ED 030 482)

Hernan Rodriguez, Some Problems of Bilingualism in Acculturation of Puerto Ricans in New York City (Master's thesis, City College of New York, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. M-1153)

Morris Rosenberg, "Parental Interest and Children's Self-Conceptions," Sociometry, March, 1963)

________, Society and the Adolescent Self-Image (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1966)

Joan B. Rosenblatt, Measure of Impulse Control as Related to First Grade Children's Socio-Economic Class and Ethnic Group Background (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-14, 514)

Michael Rosenfeld, Negro-White Differences in Intellectual Growth, (August 30, 1968, (ERIC # ED 024 073)

David L. Rosenhan, "Effects of Social Class and Race on Responsiveness to Approval and Disapproval," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4 (1966)

________, "The Kindnesses of Children," Young Children, 25 (1969)

Robert Rosenthal, "Changing Children's I.Q. by Changing Teachers' Expectations," unpublished paper read before the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, September 2, 1966

Rodney W. Roth, "The Effects of 'Black Studies' on Negro Fifty Grade Students," Journal of Negro Education, 38 (1969)

________, The Effects of Integral Curriculum on Negro and White Fifth Grade Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-18,095)

Arthur J. Rubel, Across the Tracks: Mexican-Americans in Texas City (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1966)

________, Social Life of Urban Mexican-Americans (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1962) (University Microfilms Order No. 63-3561)

David B. Ryckman, "A Comparison of Information Processing Abilities of Middle and Lower Class Negro Kindergarten Bots," Expectional Children, 33 (1966-1967)

________, Psychological Processes of Disadvantaged Children (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-12)

Leonard F. Sain, Occupational Preferences and Expectations of Negro Students Attending a High School Located in a Lower Socio-Economic Area (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-10,119)

Mrs. Eric Salzman (letter) New York World-Journal-Tribune, October 14, 1966

Ivan G. Samuels, Desegregated Education and Differences in Academic Achievement (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1958) (University Microfilms Order No. 58-2934)

James A. Sartain, Attitudes of Parents and Children Towards Desegregation (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-10,999)

Joseph A. Sarthory, The Effects of Ability Grouping in Multi-Cultural School Situations (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11,664)

Herbert Ravenel Sass, Mixed Schools and Mixed Blood (Jackson, Mississippi: Citizens Council, 1956)

Walter E. Schafer and Carol Olexa, High School Track Position and Academic Achievement, April, 1969 (ERIC # ED 030 188)

________, and Kenneth Polk, "Delinquency and the schools," Appendix M in the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime (Washington, D.C.: Goverment Printing Office, 1967)

Elnore Schmadel, Phil Merrifield, and Henry Johnson, "The Performance of Mexican-American and Anglo-American Pupils on the Minnesota Test of Creative Thinking," unpublished paper read to the CASPP annual conference, March 20, 1964

Richard Schmuck and Margaret B. Lusski, A Comparison of Negro and White Students in Several Small Midwest Communities (no place, no publisher, no date)

Frank Wheeler Schneider, Differences Between Negro and White School Children in Conforming Behavior (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1969) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-17,040)

Ruth Schroff, A Study of Social Distance Between Mexican Parents and American Teachers in San Bernardino, California (Master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1936

Mildred A. Schwartz, Trends in White Attitudes Toward Negroes (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1967)

John C. Scott, Jr., Race and Culture Contact in Southeastern Alaska: A Study of the Assimilation and Acculturation of the Wrangell Tlingit and White (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1953)

Ralph Scott, "First to Ninth Grade I.Q. Changes of Northern Negro Students," Psychology in the Schools, April, 1966

________, "Social Class, Race, Seriating and Reading Readiness: A Study of Their Relationship at the Kindergarten Level," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 115 (1969)

William H. Sewell, Leonard A. Marascuilo, and Harold W. Pfautz, Review Symposium on the Equal Educational Opportunity Survey, American Sociological Review, June, 1967

Patricia Cayo Sexton, "Comments on Three Cities," Integrated Education, August, 1963

________, Education and Income (New York: Viking, 1961)

Ruth C. Shaffer and Albert Schaffer, "Socialization and the Development of Attitudes Toward Negroes in Alabama," Phylon, 27 (1966)

Audrey M. Shuey, The Testing of Negro Intelligence, 2nd ed. (New York: Social Science Press, 1966)

Irving E. Sigel and Patricia Olmsted, Modification of Cognitive Skills among Lower-Class Negro Children: A Follow-up Training Study, August, 1968

Dorothy G. Singer, Interracial Attitudes of Negro and White Fifth-Grade Children in Segregated and Unsegregated Schools (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-2836)

________, "Reading, Writing, and Race Relations," Trans-Action, June, 1967

Harry Singer, Effect of Integration on Achievement in Riverside: A Three-Year Trend, August 31, 1969)

Surendra Pratap Singh, A Comparison Between Privileged Negroes, Underprivileged Negroes, Privileged Whites, and Underprivileged White Children on a Test of Creativity (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-232)

Emil George Sitkei, Comparative Structure of Intellect in Middle and Lower-Class Four-Year-Old Children of Two Ethnic Groups (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-5310)

Irene Wholl Slone, The Effects of One School Pairing on Pupil Achievement, Anxities, and Attitudes (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 808)

D. B. Smith, *Report on Differences in Ethnic Learning Styles*, 1966 (ERIC # ED 015 253)

Ralph V. Smith, Stanley E. Flory, Rashid L. Bashshur, and Gary W. Shannon, *Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area: An Ecological Analysis* (Ypsilanti, Michigan: Eastern Michigan University, September 8, 1967)

Anthony T. Soares and Louise M. Soares, "Self-Perceptions of Culturally Disadvantaged Children," *American Educational Research Journal*, 6 (1969)

Benjamin Solomon (letter), *Harvard Educational Review*, 39 (1969)

Daniel Solomon, *Psychosocial Deprivation and Achievement Dispositions* (Bethesda, Maryland: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1968)

________, Robert J. Parelius, and Thomas V. Busse, *Dimensions of Achievement-Related Behavior Among Lower-Class Negro Parents* (ERIC # ED 021 004)

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, *Proceedings, National Conference on Educational Opportunities for Mexican Americans*, 1968 (ERIC # ED 031 345)

John P. Spiegel in U.S. Congress, 90th, 1st session, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, *Antiriot Bill--1967 Hearings*, Part 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967)

David Spitz, "Politics and the Realms of Being--A Reply," *Dissent*, Winter, 1959

Albert W. Spruill, *Consequences Encountered by Negro Teachers in the Process of Desegregation of Schools in Four Southern States* (Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1958) (University Microfilms Order No. 59-1518)

John R. Stabler, Edward E. Johnson, and Melvyn A. Berke, *The Relationship Between Race and Perception of Racially-Related Stimuli in Preschool Children*, 1967 (ERIC # ED 030 483)

Frank H. Stallings, "A Study of the Immediate Effects of Integration on Scholastic Achievement in the Louisville

Public Schools," *Journal of Negro Education*, Winter, 1959

________, [Statement in] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights *Second Annual Conference on Problems of Schools in Transition from the Educator's Viewpoint* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, (1960)

Lawrence H. Stewart, Arthur A. Dole, and Yeuell Y. Harris, "Cultural Differences in Abilities During High School," *American Education Research Journal*, 4 (1967)

Harold N. Stinson, *The Effect of Desegregation on the Adjustment and Values of Negro and White Students* (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1963) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-5089)

Nancy H. St. John, "De Facto Segregation and Interracial Association in High School," *Sociology of Education*, Summer, 1964

________, "Minority Group Performance Under Various Conditions of School Ethnic and Economic Integration," *IRCD Bulletin*, May, 1968

________, *Minority Group Performance Under Various Conditions of School Ethnic and Economic Integration: A Review of Research* (New York: ERIC, Teachers College, Columbia University [1969]) (ERIC # ED 021 945)

________, "The Effect of Segregation on the Aspirations of Negro Youth," *Harvard Educational Review*, Summer, 1966

Susan S. Stodolsky and Gerald S. Lesser, "Learning Patterns in the Disadvantaged," *Harvard Educational Review* (1967)

Robert Stout and Morton Inger, *School Desegregation: Progress in Eight Cities*, unpublished study prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1966)

George D. Strayer, *The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949)

Leila Sussman, "Democratization and Class Segregation in Puerto Rican Schooling: The U.S. Model Transplanted," *Sociology of Education*, 41 (1968)

Hilda Taba, School Culture. *Studies of Participation and Leadership* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1955

Harry A. Tanser, *The Settlement of Negroes in Kent County, Ontario, and A Study of the Mental Capacity of Their Descendents* (Chatham, Ontario: Sheperd Publishers, 1939)

Charlotte P. Taylor, *Some Changes in Self-Concept in the First Year of Desegregated Schooling: The Outward Walls and the Inward Scars* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-13, 169)

"Teaching in Center-City Schools," *N.E.A. Journal*, December, 1967

James E. Teele, Ellen Jackson, and Clara Mayo, "Family Experiences in Operation Exodus," in U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hearing Held in Boston, Massachusetts, October 4-5, 1966* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967)

Stanton K. Tefft, "Anomy, Values and Culture Change Among Teen-Age Indians" An Exploratory Study," *Sociology of Education*, 40 (1967)

Warren David Ten Houten, *Socialization, Race and the American High School* (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-444)

Alexander Thomas, *Retardation in Intellectual Development o Lower-Class Puerto Rican Children in New York City* (New York: New York University Medical Center, May 31, 1969)

Cleveland A. Thomas, "The Independent School and Desegregation," *School Review*, 69 (1961)

W. I. Thomas, "Race Psychology: Standpoint and Questionnaire, with Particular Reference to the Immigrant and the Negro," *American Journal of Sociology*, 17 (1911-1912)

Robert L. Thorndike, *Free Choice Open Enrollment--Junior High Schools* (New York: Center for Urban Education, August 31, 1966)

Claiburne Burnice Thorpe, Status, Race and Aspiration. A Study of the Desire of High School Students to Enter a Professional or a Technical Occupation (Doctoral dissertation, New School for Social Research, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-17,870)

Richard D. Trent, "The Relation Between Expressed Self-Acceptance and Expressed Attitudes Toward Negroes and Whites Among Negro Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, September, 1957

Calvin Trillin, An Education in Georgia. The Integration of Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes (New York: Viking, 1964)

Steve R. Tulkin, "Race, Class, Family and School Achievement," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9 (1968)

________, and J. R. Newbrough, "Social Class, Race, and Sex Differences on the Raven (1956) Standard Progressive Matrices," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32 (1968)

Melvin Tumin, Desegregation: Resistance and Readiness (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1949)

________, "Pie in the Sky: A Reply," Dissent, Winter 1959)

Horacio Ulibarri, Teacher Awareness of Socio-Cultural Classrooms (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1959) (University Microfilms Order No. 60-1261)

Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory, First National Indian Education Conference, Conference Packet Report, December 17, 1969, 1640 East 78th Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55423

Urban Education Task Force, "Report on Urban Education," Congressional Record, January 19 and 20, 1970

U.S.A. v. Hinds County School District. Transcript. October, 1968

U. S. Bureau of the the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 190, "School Enrollement: October, 1968 and 1967," (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969)

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Conference on Education

(Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959)

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Equal Protection of the Laws in Public Higher Education (Washington, D.: Government Printing Office, 1960)

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967)

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967) Appendix CI, "Further Analysis of Equality of Educational Opportunity," Appendix C3, "Educational Consequences of Segregation in a California Community," Appendix C2, "The Racial Composition of Schools and College Aspiration of Negro Students"

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Second Annual Conference on Problems of Schools in Transition from the Educator's Viewpoint, Gatlinburg, Tennessee (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960)

U.S. Congress, 84th, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the District of Columbia, Subcommittee to Investigate Public School Standards and Conditions and Juvenile Delinquency in the District of Columbia, Investigation of Public School Conditions (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956)

U.S. Congress, 89th, 1st and 2nd sessions, House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Task Force on Antipoverty in the District of Columbia, Investigation of the Schools and Poverty in the District of Columbia. Hearings (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966)

U.S. Congress, 89th, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Special Subcommittee on Civil Rights, Guidelines for School Desegregation Hearings (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966)

U.S. Congress, 89th, 2nd session, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, Federal Role in Urban Affairs, *Hearings*, Parts 2 and 6 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), testimony of John W. Gardner and Harold Howe II in Part 2. See also letters to Senator Abrham Ribicoff from Ernest Q. Campbell, James S. Coleman, and Harold Howe II, Part 2 and letter from Campbell to Senator Albert Gore in Part 6

U.S. Congress, 90th, 1st session, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education, *Bilingual Education Hearings*, II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967)

U.S. Office of Education, *Supplemental Appendix to the Survey on Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966)

Donald Vandenberg, "Ideology and Educational Policy," *Journal of Educational Thought*, April, 1967

Ernest van den Haag, *Negroes, Intelligence and Prejudice* (New York: International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, Inc., n.d.) (reprinted from *National Review*, December 1, 1964)

________, "Social Science Testimony in the Desegregation Cases--A Reply to Professor Kenneth Clark," *Villanova Law Review*, Fall, 1960

Julia R. Vane, "Relation of Early School Achievement to High School Achievement When Race, Intelligence and Socioeconomic Factors are Equated," *Psychology in the Schools*, 3 (1966)

________, Jonathan Weitzman, and Adrian P. Applebaum, "Performance of Negro and White Children and Problem and Nonproblem Children on the Stanford-Binet Scale," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 22 (1966)

Thorstein Veblen, "The Evolution of the Scientific Point of View," in *The Place of Science in Modern Civilization and Other Essays* (New York: Viking, 1942)

Joseph Veroff and Stanton Peels, "Initial Effects of Desegregation on the Achievement Motivation of Negro Elementary School Children," *Journal of Social Issues*, 25 (1969)

Virgil J. Vogel, The Indian in American History (Chicago, Illinois: Integrated Education Associates, 1968)

James Donald Vogler, The Influence of Ethnicity and Socioeconomic Status on the Pictorial Test of Intelligence (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 833)

Jacob Volkman, The Informal Social Environment in a Public Housing Development: A Survey of the Social Behavior, the Attitudes, and the Feelings of Project Tenants Toward The Project and Its Population (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-172)

Clement E. Vontress, "Cultural Differences: Implications for Counseling," Journal of Negro Education, Summer, 1969

Lawrence E. Vredevoe, "The Effects of Desegregation on School Discipline," Education Digest, April, 1965

________, "The Effort to Desegregate and Its Effects Upon School Discipline and Attitudes," Journal of Secondary Education, February, 1967

Dollie Walker, Arthur S. Stinchcombe, and Mary S. McDill, School Desegregation in Baltimore (Baltimore, Maryland: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, August, 1967)

William W. Wayson, Expressed Motives of Teachers in Slum Schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1966)

Staten W. Webster, Intergroup Contact in a Newly Integrated School and Its Effect Upon the Levels of Acceptance and Friendship Choices of a Selected Group of Seventh-Grade Pupils (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1960)

________, "The Influence of Interracial Contact on Social Acceptance in a Newly Integrated School," Journal of Educational Psychology, LII (1961)

________, and S.E. Torsten Lund, "Defectors and Persisters: Teachers of Disadvantaged Students," Integrated Education, 7 (1969)

________, and Nathaniel Pugh, The Team Approach to Solving Problems of Desegregation and the Disadvantaged Student in the Oakland Public Schools, April 25, 1967 (ERIC # ED 030 701)

Rachel T. Weddington, The Relative Influence of Social Class and Color on the Stereotypes of Young Children (Doctoral dissertation, Committee on Human Development, University of Chicago, 1948)

Meyer Weinberg, Report on Techniques for Achieving Racially Desegregated Superior Quality Education in the Public Schools of Chicago, Illinois, unpublished paper prepared for the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights, October 23, 1967

Meyer Weinberg, Research on School Desegregation: Review and Prospect (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1965)

__________ (compiler), School Integration. A comprehensive Classified Bibliography of 3,100 References (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1967)

__________ and Oscar Shabat, Society and Man, second edition (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965)

Julius Weissman, An Exploratory Study of Communication Patterns of Lower-Class Negro and Puerto Rican Mothers and Pre-School Children (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-5551)

Marilyn Marie Wendland, Self-Concept in Southern Negro and White Adolsecents As Related to Rural-Urban Residence (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-1695)

Emmy E. Werner, Kenneth Simonian, and Ruth S. Smith, "Ethnic and Socioeconomic Status Differences in Abilities and Achievement Among Preschool and School-Age Children in Hawaii," Journal of Social Psychology, 75 (1968)

Norma E. Werner and Idella M. Evans, "Perception of Prejudice in Mexican American Preschool Children," Perceptual and Motor Skills, 27 (1968)

Alden E. Wessman, Evaluation of Project ABC (A Better Chance). An Evaluation of Dartmouth College--Independent Schools Scholarship Programs for Disadvantaged High School Students, April, 1969 (ERIC # ED 031 549)

Herbert W. Wey, "Desegregation--It Works," *Phi Delta Kappan,* May, 1964

________, and John Corey, *Action Patterns in School Desegregation. A Guidebook* (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1959)

White Plains Public Schools, "Analysis of Pupil Registration by School Showing Percent Negro," August 30, 1967

Martin Whiteman and Martin Deutsch, "Social Disadvantage as Related to Intellective and Language Development," in *Social Class, Race and Psychological Development*, edited by Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz and Arthur R. Jensen (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968)

Paul Gordon Whitmore, Jr., *A Study of School Desegregation: Attitude Change and Scale Validation* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1956) (University Microfilms Order No. 20, 501)

Preston R. Wilcox, "Teacher Attitudes and Student Achievement," *Teachers College Record,* 68 (1966-1967)

Alfred D. Wiley, *A Study of Desegregation in the Evansville School Corporation, Evansville, Indiana* (doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1961). Summary in Dissertation Abstracts, XXII (1962)

Frank E. Williams, *An Analysis of Some Differences Between Negro High School Seniors From a Segregated High School and a Nonsegregated High School in Brevard County, Florida* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-16, 050)

Jay Reifle Williams, *Social Stratification and the Negro American: An Exploration of Some Problems in Social Class Measurement* (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-14, 338)

John E. Williams and C. Drew Edwards, "An Exploratory Study of the Modification of Color and Racial Concept Attitudes in Preschool Children," *Child Development,* 40 (1969)

Robert L. Williams, "Cognitive and Affective Components of Southern Negro Students' Attitude Toward Academic Integration," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 76 (1968)

________, and Spurgeon Cole, "Scholastic Attitudes of Southern Negro Students," Journal of Negro Education, Winter, 1969

Robert M. Williams, Jr., and Margaret W. Ryan, editors, Schools in Transition. Community Experiences in Desegregation (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954)

Alan B. Wilson, "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," American Sociological Review, December, 1959

________, The Effect of Residential Segregation Upon Educational Achievement and Aspirations (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1960)

Kenneth M. Wilson, Black Students Entering CRC Colleges: Their Characteristics and Their First-Year Academic Performance, April 15, 1969 (ERIC # ED 030 897)

Sven F. Winther, E. Bruce Potter, and William H. Ruber, A Longitudinal Study of the Beginning Freshman Class of 1963 at the University of New Mexico. The Invisible Student, May, 1969 (ERIC # ED 030 532)

James H. Wise, "Self-Reports by Negro and White Adolescents to the Draw-a-Person," Perceptual and Motor Skills, 28 (1969)

Paul A. Witty and A. I. Decker, "A Comparative Study of the Educational Attainment of Negro and White Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, XVIII (1927)

T. G. Wolman, "Learning Effects of Integration in New Rochelle," Integrated Education, December, 1964-January, 1965

Bruce Hartley Wood, The Effects of Busing Versus Non-Busing on the Intellectual Functioning of Inner City, Disadvantaged Elementary School Children (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1969)(University Microfilms Order No. 69-5186)

Dan Woods, "A Brief History of Operation Exodus," Integrated Education, October-November, 1966

Ruth Wylie and Edwin B. Hutchins, "Schoolwork-Ability Estimates and Aspirations as a Function of Socioeconomic Level, Race, and Sex," Psychological Reports, 21 (1967)

Richard Bruce Zamoff, *Elementary School Teachers as a Scource of Support for or Resistance to a Program of Quality Desegregated Public Education* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-683)

Norman E. Zinberg, "A Group Approach With the School Teacher in the Integration Crisis," *Mental Hygiene*, April, 1967